The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1933 NUMBER 957

Philura Genie Baldwin Memorial Library

Contents

The Week 197

Editorials

The Day of Reckoning..... 201
The Peacetime Army 202
Who Burned the Reichstag?..... 203

General Articles

Russian Medicine: A Social Challenge.....
.....John A. Kingsbury 204
Eye-Witness in Berlin.....Y. K. W. 207
Panaceas for the Depression....John Chamberlain 208
Overstuffed Opera.....Lee Simonson 210
To Shakespeare (verse).....Hart Crane 212
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 213
Financial Merry-Go-Round.....John T. Flynn 214
The Problem of Art Criticism: II....Stark Young 215
Alabama Speaks..... 217

Correspondence 218

Reviews of Books

The Hudson River Progressive....Edmund Wilson 219
Our Second-best Prose.....Robert Morss Lovett 220
The Mystery of Mary Stuart.....Cuthbert Wright 221
Why Call It Liberalism?..Henry Steele Commager 221
Miners Out of Work .....T. R. Carskadon 222
Book Notes 222

The Week

DOES Mr. Roosevelt propose to get out of the depression by saving or spending? We do not know, and we are not sure that he himself knows. Thus far, his chief activities have been toward economy, which means that they are deflationary. Under this head comes the effort to save $1,000 million annually, of which the cuts in veterans' pay, the 15-percent reduction in federal salaries, the reorganization of government departments, et cetera, are a part. It is true that the President is now talking about new bond issues of perhaps $8,000 million, but three-quarters of this are for refunding farm and urban mortgages and will do little directly to increase consumer purchasing power. The President's peacetime army is of course a spending device; but the amount of money involved is comparatively small and less than 2 percent of the unemployed will get jobs under this scheme. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has $1,350 million on hand to spend for self-liquidating public works and Senator Wagner has introduced a bill liberalizing the conditions under which it can be loaned; but many experts believe that four or five times this sum is the smallest amount that will have any appreciable effect in an expansionist direction. The country ought to know whether the President is trying to get us out of the depression through the little end of deflation or through the big end of inflation, or whether he is trying a combination of both, and, if so, how it is expected to work.

WILL the Roosevelt administration presently be engaged in investigating the dubious acts of the Hoover regime? Recent happenings suggest that it will. The Senate Banking Committee proposes to look into the extraordinary delay in the prosecution of Joseph W. Harriman of the Harriman National Bank and Trust Company—a delay which was ordered, for no apparent reason, by high Washington officials. There are other examples of seeming reluctance on the part of Mr. Hoover's aides to prosecute important people even when they were notoriously breaking the law. An important part of the investigation is likely to be the peculiar policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, often discussed in these pages. It is known that Mr. Roosevelt approves of the plan for the Senate Banking Committee to continue its Wall Street investigation, which has already been responsible for the downfall of Charles E. Mitchell; and Secretary Woodin has promised prompt prosecution and full publicity in the case of miscreant bank officials—a policy which has already begun to operate in Detroit. Exposures of bad banking practice, of course, will be of little use if they merely put individuals in the pillory. Even Mr. Mitchell, outrageous as his actions were, was only one member of a fairly large group. Unless we smash the system which produced the group, we are wasting our time.

HITLER'S education is proceeding rapidly. Already he is being taught two important lessons—though he does not seem to have learned them: that a country cannot live to itself alone, and that a rigid censorship on news opens the way for the dissemination of every sort of wild rumor. His acts of terrorism against Republicans, Socialists, Communists and particularly, those against Jews,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have brought instant action from abroad. Orders placed with German firms have been canceled, German steamship lines find their business cut, tourists are changing their plans to keep away from the Fatherland. Demands are being made that other countries break diplomatic relations with the Brown Shirt government. Under this pressure, Hitler and his group have acted in a way which confirms all the reports of their lack of intelligence. They say (a) that there has been no terror, (b) that the terror is now over and (c) that unless the foreign agitation is instantly stopped, they will begin a campaign of reprisals, directed particularly against the Jews, which will make their former efforts look like initiation ceremonies in a girls' school.

WHAT are the facts about the German terror? Enough authentic information has now trickled through to permit an adequate statement. Generally speaking, Jews have been beaten and political enemies have been locked up. The Nazi propaganda had for years promised that the Jews would be "exterminated"; and after the victory, no official orders were needed for the undisciplined Storm Troops to begin a spontaneous campaign. There is no doubt whatever that thousands of inoffensive Jewish citizens have been maltreated, even though it is doubtless true that thousands of others have thus far escaped without physical damage. Far more serious, however, in the long run is the campaign of economic persecution which is now under way. Jews are being dismissed wholesale from all government posts; they are debarred from practising their professions; their mercantile establishments are picketed and boycotted. This campaign cannot be repudiated by the Hitler government, since it was one of the main planks in the Nazi program. It would have gone on if there had been no foreign protest, and nothing that can be done outside Germany is, in our judgment, likely to mitigate it.

THE Jews in America have raised a mighty protest against the treatment of their German coreligionists; and they have been entirely right in doing so. We regret, however, that whether accidentally or by design they have said hardly a word about the sufferings of other German groups which are feeling the iron heel of a bloody tyranny even more severely. The Jews constitute only one per cent of the German population, but there are many millions of Communists, Socialists, Republicans and even Catholics who are being suppressed (Hitler's list of enemies is surprisingly like that of Ku Klux Klan). Thousands of leaders of these groups, and the Communists in particular, have been arrested and put away in great "concentration camps" where they are suffering serious hardships. Some individuals have "disappeared," and if the history of other dictatorships is a sound guide, they will never be heard of again. Hitler's political persecutions deserve protest quite as much as his racial and religious attacks, and it is regrettable that American sympathizers with any one German group should, even by inadvertence, seem callous to the sufferings of the others.

BY THE enabling act that in theory gave to the Cabinet, actually to Adolf Hitler, full authority to conduct the affairs of the Reich for the next four years, President von Hindenburg has been deprived of practically every right that was his under the Weimar Constitution. The Hugenberg majority in the Cabinet, allegedly appointed by the President as a check on Hitler's power, has, to all intents and purposes, disappeared. To the three National Socialists in the original Cabinet Dr. Göbbels has been added and Dr. Grüttner will be replaced by a Nazi Minister of Justice. Further, the arrest of Dr. Gereke and the appointment of Colonel Hierle in his place would leave Hugenberg with a majority of one but for the very recent discovery that General von Blomberg is a Hitler intimate and admirer. This places the Chancellor in a position to rid himself and his Cabinet of any Minister who may attempt serious opposition to his plans. That a government so dictatorial and equipped with so much power should bow to public opinion in foreign countries to the extent to which this has been the case is astounding and shows that no country can afford entirely to disregard the rest of the world. Hermann Göring's hypocritical assurances that anti-Semitic excesses, in so far as they have been committed, are a thing of the past and that no discrimination against the Jew is contemplated are belied by the official announcement, on the following day, that no Jew can sit as judge in a criminal court or serve as prosecuting attorney. Indeed, it would be well not to place too much credence in the protestations of the government even though they are backed up by "voluntary" testimony from Jewish organizations in Germany. Dr. Jacob Leschinsky, who has, for a number of years, represented the Jewish Forward in Berlin and was expelled from Germany after two weeks of arrest, cabled from Prague on March 22: "One can find no words to describe the fear and terror, the tragedy that envelops German Jews. They are being beaten, terrorized and murdered and, to cap the climax, they are forced to keep quiet about it."

MORE far reaching in its effect is the condition of the labor movement in Germany. Many thousands of men and women, Communists, Socialists and Syndicalists, have been interned in concentration camps in various parts of the country: the government admits 8,000 to 10,000 and from Dutch Communist sources come estimates as high as 80,000. Yet, in the words of Dr. Wilhelm Frick, the "work has only just begun." The prisoners in these camps are subjected to a routine of forced labor and military training and are required to attend prayer meetings twice daily. Three years passed before Mussolini dared to dissolve the Socialist economic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizations of Italy and to establish his Fascist trade unions. Hitler works faster. Four days after the historic Reichstag session, his appointees in a number of states were ordered to direct the local organizations of the German Trade Union Federation toward a Fascist trade-union policy. The Reich Commissar for the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior, Adolf Wagner, invited the trade-union leaders of Munich to his office to inform them that they were to continue their work, but without Marxian politics and that they must refrain from making unreasonable demands upon their employers. The Reich Commissar Schröder in Lübeck appointed a National Socialist official as director over the trade unions. Reich Commissar von Killinger of Saxony assured the trade unions of that highly industrial state that he would defend their interests but would regard them as criminals if they interfered with the orderly process of industrial and economic life. He, too, appointed a Nazi trade-union director. The Berliner Lokal Anzeiger, Hugenberg's chief organ, published an editorial by the Nationalist Reichstag member Dr. Erich Schmidt demanding the dissolution of all trade unions. The industrialists of Germany who, at a recent conference of their organization in Berlin, endorsed the Hitler government, are insisting on the immediate redemption of the promises made to them. They paid the piper and are ordering the tune.

A VERY pretty little mess has been stirred up through Japan's action in resigning from the League of Nations. Among her war spoils were a large number of islands in the Pacific, in the Caroline and Marshall groups, formerly owned by Germany but now allotted to Japan under a League mandate. When it became evident that the Japanese intended to leave the League, the Geneva officials pointed out sweetly that in that case, they must hand over the mandated islands. Not at all, replied the Japanese: these islands were given to us by the Allies in a secret treaty during the War, afterward confirmed by the Allied Supreme Council. We intend to keep them, League or no League. Geneva is forced to admit that there was such a provision in the notorious secret treaties of which President Wilson took such pains to remain in ignorance; but the League lawyers argue that all these treaties were abrogated when the high contracting powers afterward signed public agreements on the same subject. To add to the confusion, Hitler comes along and demands that the islands be restored to Germany. Their usefulness to her, of course, would be next to nothing; Japan would find them of great value in case of war with the United States, but Germany is not interested in a naval struggle in the Pacific. She wants the islands back, (a) in order to trade them off for more important things nearer home, (b) to signalize the repudiation of the Versailles Treaty and (c) God save the mark, as an excuse to burden German taxpayers with a new, big and useless navy.

ON PAGE 217 of this issue, The New Republic prints a digest of a group of letters received from prominent citizens of Alabama regarding the Scottsboro case. When these letters are considered not only for what they say, but for what they omit, they are, in our judgment, the most shocking piece of evidence yet brought forward in regard to this case. They show these men, who by virtue of their position ought to create the public opinion of their state, as almost completely evading that responsibility. Hardly one of them, by his own confession, has taken the trouble to inform himself regarding the facts, although it was easily possible to do so. Only two of them appear to be aware of the decision of the United States Supreme Court holding that the first trial was unfair, and one of these two mentions it only indirectly and ignores its implications. A Representative in Congress seems to assume that the defendants are now being tried for the first time. It may be, of course, that our correspondents are correct: that the United States Supreme Court was in error, that Alabama tribunals are infallible and that a Negro has an equal chance before a white jury with anyone else; but the complacency of their tone is far from encouraging.

SERIOUS trouble may result from the dispute between Great Britain and Soviet Russia over the allegations of sabotage by British citizens employed in the U.S.S.R. Five British and nine Russian engineers, employees of the Metropolitan-Vickers Electrical Company, have been arrested and are about to be tried as saboteurs. The Tory government of Great Britain followed the extraordinarily stupid course of attempting to bully the Russian government into setting the defendants free: London should have known that the U.S.S.R. would not take such a serious step as arresting five British citizens without having at least substantial evidence supporting the charge on which the arrest was made. Great Britain has no more right to claim extra-territoriality for her citizens in Russia than the Russians have to make a similar demand for their nationals in England. The trial will be public; the British may send as many official observers as they please. After they have seen unjust procedure, it will be time enough to lodge official complaints. In the meantime, talk about breaking off trade and diplomatic relations is as unwise as it is premature.

AT LAST a little good news from California about Tom Mooney. Judge Louis H. Ward of the Superior Court has taken the advice offered, so many years ago, by President Wilson's mediation commission, and has granted him a new trial, under another indictment which had been left hanging over him. If this had been done when the Wilson commission first recommended it, Mooney would probably have been acquitted, and might easily have been pardoned years earlier, sparing California and the United States as a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole a humiliating spectacle of injustice perpetrated and maintained as an incident of class war. Everyone in San Francisco takes it for granted that Mooney will be acquitted in his new trial; as our readers well know, there has never been any testimony against him which was not either proved to be perjured or afterward repudiated by the witness. Indeed, the present district attorney used this fact to support a curious argument that the trial ought not to be held at all. For, he says,

> Mooney's former conviction was unjustified; there is not at this time evidence available that would support a conviction. . . . I have repeatedly urged the Governors to pardon the defendant on the ground that, in the light of our present knowledge, his former conviction is unjustified.

It is true, as the district attorney points out, that an acquittal in this case would not set Mooney free. It would, however, tremendously increase the pressure on the present and future Governors of California to pardon him. We are glad to note that despite the opposition of the district attorney, Judge Ward has insisted that the trial take place.

THE Ultimate and Irreversible Council of Social and Economic Policy of the United States, often known for the sake of brevity as the Supreme Court, has made news in its decision to allow the coal dealers of the Appalachian territory to combine to distribute and sell coal and to attempt to stabilize a badly wrecked industry. Exactly what the action means or may mean to American industry is so far not clear. It has been hailed as the first step in the decent burial of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, which has so gently nourished the particular forms of corporate life it was supposed to destroy. As a matter of fact it is certainly not the first step, if it is a step at all, in abolishing the regulatory powers of the Sherman Act. The failure of Congress to make appropriations for enforcing certain parts of the Act began the process in President Wilson's administration. Senator Norris's labor legislation cut a number of the Gordian knots with which the act had tied the hands of the labor unions. Furthermore, although the benefit of the blessings of the courts has never before been given to cartels, there have in fact been many working agreements between companies which might be supposed to be deadly rivals, but which somehow simply aren't. It is true that in writing the present decision of the Court, in which all of its members concurred except Associate Justice McReynolds, Chief Justice Hughes appears to have based his opinion upon the fact that the association of the particular companies involved in the case before him would be largely ineffective in achieving the aims for which they were associating. The ruin of the coal-mining industry has been in no small measure due to "fair competition" and the Chief Justice was able to satisfy himself that "the evidence fails to show that any effect [upon the stabilization and raising of prices] will be produced which in the circumstances of this industry will be detrimental to fair competition." Such a decision makes the claims offered in its name that the Sherman Law is now to be broken without any attempt at concealment look a trifle extravagant.

NEW YORK STATE Attorney General John J. Bennett, Jr., seems to be an easily satisfied gentleman. He has just given the Straus Securities Company, of New York City, a clean bill of health after a brief examination into the facts about it. This examination was prompted when the receivers for S. W. Straus and Company, Inc., resigned their places on the ground that they were powerless to do anything for the holders of defaulted real-estate bonds which had been sold by the latter company to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. The receivers, former Senator William M. Calder and Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Council of Parks, observed that "S. W. Straus and Company have simply moved downtown and gone into business again under a slightly different name." This happened after the company had been enjoined from selling securities in the state of New York, at the end of a year's vigorous fight by Mr. Bennett. Ostensibly the receivership and injunction marked an important victory. But actually, they were no such thing.

FIVE of the company's officers were named in the action for fraud brought by the Attorney General, who asked for an open trial. At such a trial the officers would have been called on to testify and a few interesting truths about real-estate financing would have been aired. This, above all, the company wanted to escape. So a receivership was agreed to, and by merely resigning their positions the officers named apparently escaped all responsibility. Such, at any rate, must have been the interpretation of the Supreme Court in Brooklyn which raised no objection to the announcement at the hearing of the formation of a new company to supersede the old. "I want the court to know," said Mr. Joseph J. Baker, Straus's attorney, "that Mr. Straus has given funds to start a new corporation and its main purpose is to help the bondholders." Thus S. W. Straus, Inc., stepped out and the Straus Securities Company stepped in. Mr. S. J. T. Straus stepped out as chairman of the board for the old company and came back as president of the new outfit. The old company was enjoined from handling the securities of its bondholders and the new company was formed to "protect" those same bondholders. No time was lost in organizing a new bondholders' committee. Officers who served on the various Straus protective committees resigned, according to a letter issued by Mr. Straus, "in favor of" the members of the new committee. This arrangement, the letter emphasizes, will make "the experience and knowledge of the Straus organization available to the Independent Bondholders' Committee and to the bond-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holders." So far as the court is concerned, the bondholders have been left out of consideration altogether. No provision was made for the control of bond issues now in default. Their destiny and disposition were left to the mercy and manipulation of independent committees. Bond prices remain as depressed as ever. The probabilities are they will seek even lower levels, for the new Straus organization, if permitted to continue, will feel more free to speculate in these securities than was the case heretofore.

The Day of Reckoning

DURING the War it was held by a minority throughout the world that the only possible basis of a durable peace would be a settlement avoiding punitive terms by the victors. If a sound world organization were to be built, it must rest on substantial equality among nations able and willing to coöperate. President Wilson's Fourteen Points seemed to offer the German people the substance of this hope, and in this understanding the Socialist revolution occurred and the discussion of peace terms began.

The Treaty of Versailles, drafted and imposed by the victorious Allies, was a betrayal of the hope. Using the many separatist nationalisms which had sprung up during the War, it carved Europe into a congeries of states which not only split the old Austro-Hungarian empire, trimmed great slices out of Germany and set up well-nigh impregnable obstacles against any Germanic hegemony of Central Europe, but destroyed the possibility of economic units large enough to maintain prosperity under the conditions of modern technique, unless the new states were willing and able to join with one another in a single producing and consuming aggregate. But French political policy, aiming to maintain a ring of allies about Germany, made such economic unity impossible. The reparations sections of the Treaty, in turn, placed upon Germany a fantastic burden of debt which she could not have carried even if she had retained her pre-war economic strength, and which was merely ludicrous under the actual conditions. The Allies treated revolutionary Germany, ready to live at peace with the world, as if it were still governed by the worst Prussian Junkerdom, and as if the only hope for the future were to keep it in economic and political subjection.

Then began a long struggle, carried on faithfully by reasonable groups outside of Germany as well as by Germans themselves, to revise this disastrous settlement. The New Republic protested against the terms of the Versailles Treaty as soon as they were known, and opposed the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations because it foresaw that the Covenant of the League was likely to be used as a binding cement of the Treaty rather than as a means of future international accommodation. Little by little the reparations burden was pared down and readjusted, but only as a result of a series of crises enforced readjustment, and always too late to prevent these crises. Meanwhile attempts to undo the damage wrought by other sections of the peace settlement all fell by the wayside. Efforts to build customs unions which would make the crazy political boundaries unimportant were defeated, partly by the opposition of France even to an economic reconstruction of Central Europe, partly by the failure of the United States to grant the tariff concessions which the existence of "most-favored-nation treaties" with us made necessary. Actual territorial readjustments of course contained so much international dynamite that they could not even be seriously discussed.

Meanwhile the poison of a misgoverned world was working within Germany. No revolution can last indefinitely which is not successful. And the German revolution could not bring material advances to the German people. The economic situation checkmated it at every turn. The Socialists of course failed to produce anything like socialism, but even if they had done so, the new Germany could scarcely have prospered as a self-contained and isolated socialist state. A realization of this, and a continued hope that a policy of reasonableness would produce reasonableness in the victors, prevented the government of Germany from doing anything except trying to play the game according to the rules which had been imposed by the Allies. It was inevitable in these circumstances that their prestige and power should suffer. Two radical groups of opposition grew—one, the Communists, who looked to eventual world revolution as the way out, and the other, the Nazi, who reverted to extreme nationalism, blamed the republic and its rulers for the nation's ills, and made the injustices of Versailles the symbols of their bid for power.

It was to be expected that the ousted militarists and monarchists would seek every opportunity for a revival of their regime. But a ruling class once discredited seldom can be reinstated except by finding new allies. By convincing the Germans that they had been betrayed in the peace, and by failing over a long period to correct the injustices there begun, the victorious nations gradually turned millions of radically inclined Germans into the nationalist camp. Workers and petty bourgeoisie, sweating under economic injustices, became convinced that these injustices were due, not, as the Socialists and Communists taught, to the class organization of capitalist society, but rather to the suppression of German power and independence. Such a movement was capable of being used, and was used, by great industrialists and financial powers (including French interests themselves) to checkmate the growth of the Left. It thus throve on the opposition of the only truly internationalist movement in Germany and, finally, somewhat to the discomfiture of many of those who had nurtured it, was swept into power. The policy of international peace without victory having been so long suppressed, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace imposed by victory is now facing a threat felt on every hand to be of the utmost seriousness.

The last-minute effort of Mr. MacDonald to bring about concessions to Germany which should have been made years before was a tragic illustration of the social lag. This type of proposal is now too late, in two senses. It is probably too late to be accepted by France and the Little Entente, since their fear of a Germany in which exclusive nationalism is in the ascendancy is far more lively than was their fear of the previous regime. And even if the concessions were made, it would be too late to strengthen the elements in Germany with which the world can live in economic and military peace. Rather it would prove to Germans that a policy of threat and bluster, of narrow nationalism, can gain what a policy of compromise and accommodation could not gain. The present ruling powers would not be appeased by concessions; rather their appetite would be whetted. It would be an international crime to turn over to the insensate stupidity of the new German government any populations, even German populations. And to strengthen them economically, or in military power, far from alleviating the plight of the oppressed German classes, would merely encourage the ruling powers to hope that a new war, precipitated at a favorable moment, could be successfully waged.

For years The New Republic has been urging the United States to make what concessions were necessary to aid Germany and the forces outside Germany which were striving to set her on her feet. What should be the policy of this country at present? It is faced with a tragic dilemma. Other European nations may easily, by the turn of the wheel, be faced with an attack by a Fascist block of states pivoting on Germany and Italy. We can take not the slightest responsibility for guaranteeing the status quo, unless we want to risk being swept into a new maelstrom of war. Even more than formerly, it would be an irreparable mistake to participate in League sanctions in any form or to take any part in the underwriting of "security" as the French understand it. On the other hand, however, we can no longer take Germany's part. It is too late to make concessions, either political or economic. Any new money lent to German governments or industry would merely serve to strengthen a regime which embodies a threat to the peace and welfare of the world. Even on narrow grounds of prudence, there is little chance that new debts created in Germany would be safe. For it is obvious that the Nazi regime embodies, not merely a sort of foolish frenzy, but a low order of intelligence which is incapable of bringing about economic reconstruction, either internally or externally. Our maxim should be—as long as Hitler rules, not a man to the Allies, and not a dollar to Germany!

The day of reckoning has come, and nothing Americans can do will avert it. If we can somehow manage to set our own house in order, we shall be lucky. The one thing we cannot afford to do is to drift into participation with one side or the other in the European duel. By some miracle it may be peacefully resolved, but to do anything which may strengthen the present regime in Germany is not to resolve it. The world must suffer, the innocent with the guilty, because it has not learned the lesson of equality and coöperation.

The Peacetime Army

THE Roosevelt-Perkins plan for a "peacetime army" is being criticized from four main sources. The deflationists believe that the depression should be allowed to run its course and object to ameliorative measures which will cost large sums of the taxpayers' money. Certain pacifists profess to believe that it is the beginning of compulsory military training, and that it may even form the nucleus of some sort of Fascist army. The American Federation of Labor objects to the proposed wage of $1 a day on the ground that this will become the standard remuneration for unskilled labor and also attacks the physical examination given applicants, fearing that those rejected will be put on some sort of black list. The Communists consider the scheme to be "forced labor." They follow the principle that the unemployed are entitled to maintenance and should not be offered the alternatives of "made work" or starvation.

Everything depends, in a case of this sort, upon the character and purposes of those who initiate and administer the plan. We do not believe either President Roosevelt or Secretary Perkins is planning any Fascist army. The plan can hardly be called forced labor if enlistment is really voluntary as is promised. The physical examination is obviously necessary for men who will be used on rough, outdoor work. The proposed wage is not $1 a day, but $1 plus board and lodging—a very different matter. The answer to the fear that wages will be dragged down is that unskilled labor is not now receiving as much as $1 a day and living expenses. Enlistment is for one year or a shorter time as provided in the regulations, and Secretary Perkins has promised that anyone who has a good reason for leaving, such as an offer of a job elsewhere, will be permitted to go.

There are obvious dangers in the plan. Men should not be taken from their families, enrolled in the army, compelled to send home their pay and this money used to cut down the relief rolls of the cities. Provision should be made for furloughs, and living and working conditions should be kept up to the mark. The chief genuine criticism of the plan, however, has to do not with its details but with its general inadequacy. While it will help to clear out a few "Hoovervilles" in the largest cities, it will take care of less than 2 percent of the unemployed. But the President and the Secretary of Labor are quite as well aware of this as anybody else.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Burned the Reichstag?

THE NEW terror in Germany began on the night of February 27, with the fire that gutted the palace of the Reichstag. Obviously there was an arson plot, and many people were involved in it, for flames appeared simultaneously in half a dozen places. But the Prussian police succeeded in capturing only one of the incendiaries, who gave his name as Marinus Van der Lübbe. He was stripped to the waist, but in his trousers pocket, conveniently, he carried a membership card in the Dutch Communist party.

All sorts of conflicting stories were given out to the press. Van der Lübbe was one of an armed band, the others having escaped—he had confessed to setting all the fires himself—he had maintained a dogged silence, grinning stupidly at his inquisitors—he had laid bare the whole plot, told of being hired by German Communists, boasted that the burning of the Reichstag was to be the signal for a general insurrection.

In any case he had furnished the excuse for which Hitler's men were impatiently waiting. That night they ordered the arrest of the one hundred Communist members of the Reichstag. On the following morning they procured from President von Hindenburg a decree suspending all the democratic rights—private property, personal liberty, freedom of press and assemblage, the privacy of letters and telegrams. They instituted a real state of siege, of martial law administered by the Hitler Storm Troopers. When we read of the terror that followed—of Socialist mayors deposed and beaten to death, of Jewish rabbis left dying in the gutter, of Communists shot "while trying to escape," of Communists and Socialists arrested by hundreds, taken into cellars and tortured for hours, thrown on the floor while Nazis stamped on their bodies, held against the wall while their teeth were knocked out with revolver butts—we can reflect that the excuse for these arrests, tortures and pogroms was the burning of the Reichstag.

Who plotted the fire? Who carried out the plot? Who is the prisoner called Marinus Van der Lübbe?

The American correspondents in Berlin who cabled the first reports of the Reichstag fire expressed a good deal of skepticism about the alleged Communist plot. They pointed out that incendiarism was contrary to Communist tactics; that the fire could only damage Communist interests, whereas it might be extremely serviceable to the Nazis. A few days later, the German censorship tightened and the correspondents ceased to mention the fire. But meanwhile the identity of Marinus Van der Lübbe was established. The name was that of a former member, not of the Communist party, but of the Dutch Communist Youth organization. Two years before, he had been expelled from it, as a police spy and *agent provocateur*. But here is the strangest feature of the whole affair. The photograph of the prisoner was finally published—and is said to bear no resemblance whatever to the photographs of the Dutch police spy.

A more detailed story of the fire, based on the testimony of refugees, has been printed in the Socialist and liberal press of Paris, Prague and Vienna. It is generally agreed in these cities that the burning of the Reichstag was a Nazi plot. The incendiaries, including the so-called Van der Lübbe, were members of the Thirty-third Fascist Storm Detachment. They entered the building through a tunnel that leads from the palace occupied by Captain Göring, the Nazi leader who was acting as president of the Reichstag. After setting fire to the building in half a dozen places, they escaped through the same tunnel. But somebody had to be arrested, so that the Communists could be blamed. For a reward of 50,000 marks, and a promise that he would be freed in two months (under Article 50 of the German Penal Code, which provides for the release of anyone "declared irresponsible at the moment when he committed the crime"), the so-called Van der Lübbe agreed to remain in the building.

This is the circumstantial story printed in European newspapers. It can neither be proved nor disproved without a full and unbiased investigation. Considering the circumstances of the case, that thousands of people have been jailed and tortured as a result of the alleged plot, and many foreigners molested, including ten American citizens; considering that the whole opposition press in Germany has been suspended, making it impossible for Communists or Socialists to reply to the charges against them—Torgler, the head of the Communist faction in the Reichstag, was imprisoned merely for denying that his party set fire to the building—considering all these facts, the civilized world should insist on there being a committee of inquiry, including non-German members, to examine all the evidence. *If the Hitler government refuses to sanction* such a committee, or to allow its opponents to present the evidence in their possession, there would remain little doubt as to which German party was responsible for the fire.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHTED, 1933, IN THE U. S., BY NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE *STARK YOUNG*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK ALVIN JOHNSON
E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES
R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian Medicine: A Social Challenge

IN SOME of its aspects, Russian medicine is today ahead of that in the United States. Moreover, medical practice in the U.S.S.R. is moving forward at a rate for which there is no comparison in America. By medicine I mean to include all types of medical and public-health services.

When I tell my American colleagues of these conclusions, based on 9,000 miles of travel in the Soviet Union over a recent period of a couple of months, most of them look at me in blank amazement. They have been taught to think of Russia as a country of illiteracy, ignorance and dirt, handicapped by a desperate lack of supplies of all kinds, and with shockingly high birth and death rates. Their first comment is usually to ask me whether I have gone Bolshevist or gone crazy. I know I have not done the first and I don't think I have done the second. My reasons for the statement made at the beginning of this article can best be explained by describing what I saw in Russia.

I visited that country in order to carry on a survey of health procedures with Sir Arthur Newsholme, formerly head of the public-health service in England. The places visited by us ranged from Leningrad and Moscow to the Black Sea, including Nizhni-Novgorod, Kazan, Stalingrad and towns in the Caucasus, in Georgia and in the Crimea. We inspected hospitals, medical centers, clinics, sanatoria, scientific institutes, day nurseries, night sanatoria, institutes for the protection of motherhood and childhood, recreation activities and rest homes.

For twenty-five years it has been part of my duty to judge the efficiency of health work, particularly the administrative aspects of it, and I can at least tell a hospital from a slaughterhouse. Sir Arthur, with his fifty years of experience as a general practitioner, public-health officer and investigator of public-health procedures in a score of countries, is a judge of indisputable authority. We were both so impressed that we fear some of our friends may think our reaction too favorable. Checking each other, we agreed upon the following statement to appear in the introduction of a book upon which we are now collaborating:

> We realized all the time that we were usually seeing the best that the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in developing. But when this best was seen repeated in the many cities visited, and when it was everywhere frankly stated that arrangements were not yet complete, that the dearth of doctors made more adequate provisions difficult for a few years, and when we were told openly of the great difficulties experienced in extending the medical provisions of cities to vast rural communities of Russia and of the very limited success hitherto achieved in overcoming these difficulties, we were forced to conclude that we were not being victimized by a window-dressing display, and that, indeed, a revolution in medical service had taken place in Russia, the methods and procedures of which constitute a challenge to the rest of the world.

In 1913 the general death rate for all Russia was 28.3 per thousand of population. Remembering that the World War brought more terrible human losses to Russia than to any other country, that this was followed by two revolutions, and then by famines causing untold misery and literally millions of deaths, and remembering further that the Russian people by and large had always in the past been grossly ignorant of sanitation and hygiene, one must marvel at what has been accomplished under enormous handicaps. By 1926 the death rate had gone down to 20.9 per thousand. In Moscow during the same period the general death rate went down from 23.1 to 13.4, an astonishing approximation to New York City, where the general rate for the same year was 12.8. Infant mortality was high in Moscow during 1913, the rate being 270 per thousand live births. By 1928-29, the rate, though still too high, had fallen to 120.

Later statistics will undoubtedly show further marked lowering of death rates. A significant index is the increase in hospital facilities. Medical centers in the Soviet Union have increased during 1929-1932 from 2,200 to 5,400. Hospital beds in towns of the R.S.F.S.R. increased in number from 111,000 in 1928 to 162,000 in 1932, while hospital beds in villages increased during the same period from 43,500 to 82,000. Still more significant is the rapid development of preventive medicine and health education, which, however, cannot readily be expressed in figures.

Two features are prominent in the Soviet health work. It is all organized under a single comprehensive plan, which in turn gears with the whole plan of government. And it is animated by the realistic attitude of leaders to whom science has become virtually a religion. In a limited space I cannot undertake even a brief account of health organization in Russia. But I may give a glimpse of how it affects the individual.

The procedure in the case of persons suffering with tuberculosis is illuminating. In the United States, as I do not need to say, a case of tuberculosis in a family is usually an economic disaster of the first magnitude. It may, and often does, involve the loss of all the family savings, perhaps the home itself. Nothing of the sort is true in Russia. There is, in the first place, a greater likelihood that the tuberculosis will be discovered in an early stage. Every worker gets a physical examination at fairly frequent intervals and invariably on assuming a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new job. If he is found with suspicious symptoms, he is referred to the Tuberculosis Institute of his city. If he needs to go away to a sanatorium his expenses are paid and he receives his full salary all the while he is away, so that his family does not suffer.

It is, of course, in regard to after-care of the tuberculous patient that American medical practice breaks down most completely. Usually the patient dismissed from a sanatorium goes to work again just as soon as he can find a job. In an appallingly large number of cases he again becomes too ill to work. In Russia, however, the patient is watched just as carefully after discharge from a sanatorium as at any other time. His day's work is adjusted to his strength. Every evening he goes to a "night sanatorium" where he has a bath, an hour's rest, supper, medical inspection, and spends the night in a bed which is practically in the open air.

Some indication of the recent development of tuberculosis work is found in the statement of the director of the Tuberculosis Institute in Moscow, who pointed out that under the Tsar there were only 350 beds for tuberculous patients in all Russia, while now there are 35,000. Tuberculosis is, of course, only one of the diseases against which the U.S.S.R. is fighting.

A fertile field of suggestion for American reorganization of health service is the Soviet protection of motherhood and childhood. Here again the approach is typically practical and scientific rather than sentimental. If a working woman, for example, becomes pregnant, she does not lose her job. On the contrary, she is given twelve to sixteen weeks' vacation with pay. Any woman may go to special clinics, "points of consultation," and get free advice regarding all the problems of maternity and child care. In cities practically all the confinements are in hospitals, where the doctor attends. If necessary, he follows up the case; otherwise this is done by a nurse who visits the mother and child. When the time comes to go back to work, the mother and her infant are given full protection. She receives time off for nursing. She may leave the child in the *crèche,* a day nursery, under expert care.

Besides the services at the clinics, and at the maternity and gynecological hospitals, further help is provided for the mother by maternity associations, which are very popular. In some districts of Moscow, we were informed, 90 percent of the mothers are members of those associations. The scientific study of obstetrics and pediatrics, as well as of allied problems of social welfare, is pursued in every large city at the Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood, which serves in general as a maternity medical center.

Babies are decidedly welcome in Russia. We were not surprised to find baby propaganda in marriage and divorce bureaus which we visited. Prospective brides and husbands, while they waited their turn to register for marriage, gazed at striking posters telling how to care for babies. On the other hand, the Russian is equally realistic about birth control whenever that is indicated for medical or eugenic reasons. There is a birth-control section in every clinic and contraceptive advice is freely given.

Under the old regime abortion was a major health problem because it was illegal. As a result crude and cruel operations were performed under cover by quacks and the death rate was appalling. Dr. Abram B. Genss, assistant director of the Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood in Moscow, told us that under the present system of legalized abortion, which he initiated, 300-000 lives have been saved in a period of twelve years. While abortion is now legal and women are entitled to have it performed by the state in well ordered clinics and hospitals, this is not undertaken except for sufficient reason, and, if possible, the woman is dissuaded. We were told that out of a group of 200 women who had applied for abortions, 190 had been dissuaded and had borne their children, while only five obtained illegally performed operations. This was in contrast with a count in an earlier period, when out of a group of 200 women similarly applying but advised by the state not to insist on the abortion, 197 had tried illegal operations, while only three had allowed the pregnancy to continue. Since abortion is considered somewhat dangerous at best, women who wish to limit offspring are advised to seek early counsel on contraception.

The rapid reduction of venereal disease in Russia is due to many factors. Registration of marriage involves signing a certificate of health. Should it be ascertained afterwards that either party had an infectious disease at the time of signing, he or she may be imprisoned for three years. The same penalty is applied to the responsible party if disease results from unmarried cohabitation. Another factor is the control of prostitution. Before the War there were 15,000 registered prostitutes in Moscow. Had the rate progressed on the old scale in relation to the growth of the city there would now be 30,000 registered. Since legalized prostitution has been abolished this vice has sharply diminished, until in 1931 there were only 700 prostitutes known to the authorities and of these about 500 are in the "prophylactoria." Should a woman be apprehended for soliciting, she is not thrown into jail, but is instead brought to a "prophylactorium," a sort of clinic and factory school combined. Inspecting one of these institutions we learned that the women are treated medically, and, what is equally important, they are given education and training for some constructive occupation.

The practical disappearance of the prostitute is undoubtedly the principal factor in the diminishing incidence of venereal disease. Every commissariat of health in the constituent republics of the Soviet Union has a section devoted to the care and pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention of venereal disease. The facts are discussed in plain language, not only in medical conference, but also in popular education regarding this problem, and no young man or woman is left ignorant of dangers. The detection of disease is, of course, greatly expedited by the compulsory physical examinations which are made when a person enters upon a new job. The whole Russian program of social hygiene is another challenge to America.

A most impressive development in Russia is the program of recreation and physical culture for children and adults. Huge Parks of Culture and Rest are either completed or under construction in practically every large city and in many of the smaller ones. In Moscow the Park of Culture and Rest, now virtually completed, extends through the heart of the city, for a great distance along both sides of the Moscow River. Here we saw many thousands of people playing, taking part in folk dancing, singing, engaged in cultural activities or just resting in friendly conversation. Mothers are able to engage in these cultural activities or to rest if they choose, because a suitable place is provided for the young children.

The Parks of Culture and Rest illustrate the close integration between health work, education and recreation. It is a pattern under which activity, as far as we could judge, is carried on with enthusiasm and efficiency. The enthusiasm may, to some extent, be stimulated from above, but it is there nevertheless. It is significant that the physical-culture societies last year counted an enrolment of 4 million, and that certain of the Young Pioneers had each pledged themselves to teach ten illiterate adults to read—another challenge to America, which still has 4.3 percent of illiteracy.

The material facilities for medical care in the Soviet Union comprise much that is old as well as the rapidly increasing portion that is new. Some of the palaces which have been taken over for health work are naturally not designed for the purpose. Yet even as interim facilities many of these buildings challenge comparison with the best in American cities. But in the new edifices, such as the polyclinics in Leningrad, Moscow, Rostov, Tiflis and Kharkov, we saw architectural designs ideally adapted for medical service, with equipment in every respect up-to-date. Light, cleanliness, comfort, convenience, capacity—all are provided to a degree not surpassed in America or in Great Britain. Leningrad, with a population of 3 million, has eight polyclinics of this new type, and Moscow, with a population of 3.5 million, has twelve.

As for medical personnel in Russia, the Soviet leaders are well aware that this is quite inadequate to cover the vast stretches of that great country. There were in 1931 only 84,000 doctors and dentists in the Soviet Union, with a population of about one hundred and sixty millions, covering one-sixth of the earth's land area. It is estimated that 125,000 medical posts are to be filled. The plan, as explained to us by Commissar Vladimirsky, calls for one doctor for every thousand population, which they hope to have by 1937. There were 36,000 medical students enrolled in 1932. Under the Tsar, there were some regions in Russia with only one doctor per 40,000 or 50,000 of population, with an average of one to 20,000 for rural areas, and an average in the larger cities of one to 3,000.

It is probable that the average Russian physician or dentist does not have professional education and training equal to the average in America. But there is no doubt that the Soviet organization of education provides amply for remedying this inadequacy. The doctor normally has a six-hour working day, and his salary varies according to personal qualifications, experience and quality of work done, and also according to the job. For example, doctors engaged in epidemic work, or in large new industrial centers, or in new construction and transport work, or in very remote districts, have higher salaries than those employed in more comfortable or less hazardous stations. Thus we see that the physician in Russia is not "a cog in a machine," as has been supposed by those skeptical of the system. Private practice is permitted, even by those doctors, 90 percent of the total number, who work in state institutions. Indeed from the point of view of compensation and conditions favorable to scientific service, the Soviet Union issues another challenge to America.

The illustrations of the functioning of socialized medicine in Russia which I have here presented seem to me typical of what can be accomplished when professional men work together under an all-embracing, clear-cut plan. For the first time in any country the varied problems of medical care have been looked at as a whole and the service for their solutions correlated, much as the general practitioner views all the symptoms of disease revealed in his patient and then prescribes a well rounded program to restore and preserve that patient's health. Not only is there a comprehensive health plan in the U.S.S.R., but its objectives are pursued with a determination and zeal that reflect the greatest credit upon the profession.

The plan that succeeds in Russia might not succeed in America. I do not suggest that we should lift the pattern whole and set it down upon ourselves. But some definite plan designed to meet in a comprehensive way our own peculiar needs is long overdue. When we accept as a rule of action the proposition that "The state's paramount concern should be the health of its people," which President Franklin D. Roosevelt recently laid down, and when we begin blocking in the outlines of an American plan which will provide at once adequate pay for medical service and adequate medical service for the entire population, we should be stupid indeed if we ignored recent developments in the Soviet Union which constitute a challenge to American medicine. JOHN A. KINGSBURY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eye-Witness in Berlin

The author of the article which appears below is an American who has lived in Germany for many years. He is unable to sign his name for fear of reprisals by the Hitler dictatorship. The New Republic hopes to print other articles by him in the near future.—THE EDITORS.

IT IS not likely that any serious accident will happen to the new German revolution in the next few weeks or months. Internal trouble for the National Socialists is almost out of the question; it is not likely that they will quarrel with their present allies too soon; their lesser mistakes have been, and will probably continue to be, washed out in the river of Fascist revolution in which Germany finds itself. Considered by themselves, these mistakes seem egregious enough—sufficient, perhaps, to wreck the aspirations of the ordinary political party. But it is a sign of the times, and a sign that Hitler and his followers are swimming with the current, that whatever they do, they come nearer their goal.

The burning of the Reichstag building is an example, and a curious political phenomenon. Perhaps it was one of the things for which Hitler asked advance forgiveness from God in one of his speeches a week or two before. I do not know what percentage of the German population believes that the Nazis themselves were the guilty ones. It is impossible to say whether the whole episode was a mistake or not. At any rate the elections prove that it was not an expensive mistake. It looked, at the start, like significant evidence of Nazi weakness, like the confession that they themselves were badly frightened. Exercising hindsight, it is easy to say that this incident, like the whole campaign of anti-Marxian propaganda, of brutality and suppression, was part of a deliberate plan to hold up to the German people the horrible menace of a Red terror, one of the most popular tricks of the post-war demagogue. I am told, however, on good authority, that the Nazis themselves, up to the very day of the election, lived in continual terror of the Communists; that they misjudged the fighting ability of their opponents on the Left.

Neither is it apparently necessary for the Nazis to understand the essential nature of their own movement, and the social forces with which they must ally themselves. In the ranks of the Reichsbanner, which is the marching organization of the Social Democracy, there are known to be rather strong yearnings toward the Right, as there are also in the trade unions.

From all the mass of evidence, from the acts of brutality, from the nearly imbecile blah of the Nazi propaganda, it looked toward the end as though the elections would not show much in the way of gains for Hitler. For one thing, very few guessed the strong movement toward the Nazis that had taken place in the more democratic south of Germany. At the start, the Communists all said that they would lose a great many peripheral hangers-on, but a good many of all shades of political opinion thought that the Social Democracy and the Catholic Center might gain considerably. It is certain that not even the Nazis themselves realized how strongly the tide had set their way.

It seems that in the period of history known as the decline of capitalism, fascist revolution is a process in whose favor there are strong natural forces at work, and now at last in Germany the way is clear for the process to take its course. As part of the process we must count the construction of its vehicle, the National Socialist German Workers' party, so that we may say that the German counter-revolution is about half over, and that the easy half lies ahead. The Communist party will be suppressed; the Social Democracy will follow. The trade unions will either be broken, or taken over. Von Hindenburg will die; the monarchy will be restored, or, much more likely, Hitler will become President—it doesn't matter very much. The parties of the Center and the Right will either be done away with or they will lose their independent political wills. At last there will be only one party in Germany, the labor movement will be dead, and enough of the working class will be supporting the new government so that it can truthfully say that it represents the will of the people: a dictatorship with a broad basis of popular support. This is the process. If there is anything in the present situation which is going to stop it, that force is not yet apparent in Germany.

Fascism for Germany appears to be the end of the present process, but possibly it will turn out to be the beginning of another. Germany, unlike Italy, is a highly industrialized land, and it seems that Hitler, unlike Mussolini, will not have years of comparative prosperity for the construction and continuance of the unified Fascist state.

Already many of the Socialists do not dare to go home at night to sleep in their own beds. Already Communists, as they are pulled out of their refuges and taken off to prison by the Storm Troopers, are being given those terrible overdoses of castor oil. The police tell their friends that countless murders are not being reported at all. The phase immediately ahead is the ugliest of the whole ugly business.

Y. K. W.

Berlin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Panaceas for the Depression

II: *The Rorty Plan for a Federal Subsidy to Business*

In his series of articles, of which this is the second, Mr. John Chamberlain discusses some of the more interesting or important panaceas which have been flourishing during the depression. The third article, to appear in the near future, will be on the subject of barter.—THE EDITORS.

ABOUT a year ago, Malcolm C. Rorty, an electrical engineer and business consultant who has been, at various times, vice-president of the International Telephone and Telegraph Company, the Bell Telephone Company and United Founders, commenced plugging the case for a federal subsidy to business as a means of getting the economic motor started. The theory of the federal subsidy may be succinctly stated: any force it may have rests upon the doctrine that revival must derive its initial impetus from new spending for construction and the making of other capital goods. This doctrine, which is extremely suspect, is a version of the "flywheel" theory of recovery: that if you can start a few little wheels whirling, the great belt lines of public consumption will eventually be pushed into motion.

The negative side of Mr. Rorty's proposal is opposition to the public-works program. Spending two billions of dollars on public works, exclusive of "self-liquidating" projects such as by-pass toll roads, tunnels and toll bridges, would be a "sterile" expenditure in Mr. Rorty's opinion, because each dollar handed out by the government would not breed sufficient additional spending power. It is true, under the Rortian analysis, that the whilom unemployed would turn over cash received for labor on the public works for consumption goods, but the taxpayers, out of whose hides the two billions must eventually come, would, by the same token, spend less. The result would be an impasse, so far as total consumption goes. Besides, the mounting tax burden necessarily attendant upon federal construction would immediately tend to destroy the very confidence which a public-works program might be counted upon to revive.

Mr. Rorty rests his case against the public-works program here. Assuming it is not now two years too late for salvation by public works, it does not impress one as a very good case, for public construction would mean, besides the basic prerequisite of spending power for reëmployed men, a large-scale purchase of raw materials, which in turn would yield increased earnings on capital investment, thus causing a rise in the securities market and a movement toward the very increase in production of capital goods which Mr. Rorty wants. The rich would lose in taxes only to gain in stock holdings and dividends. But, for the sake of the argument, let Mr. Rorty have his way. Any effective plan for the restoration of business activity, so he says, must be financed out of current government revenues and must be capable of operating continuously until the processes of a natural recovery are under way. Government funds must be so applied as to multiply effects on wage payments and purchases of materials. For every dollar spent out of taxes, there must be five or ten additional dollars spent freely by business men. For, so Mr. Rorty argues, both experience and theory show that a recovery from business depression comes only when credit and restored confidence gradually lead business men, large and small, to borrow money for new ventures, or extension of existing activities, and to spend the proceeds of such borrowings on increased pay rolls and increased buying of materials.

Whether Mr. Rorty is confusing the phenomena of business recovery with the cause, we may leave unanswered for the moment. If you grant him his assumptions, it is easy to see the logic of his subsidy proposal, and the ineffectuality at the heart of the public-works program. Mr. Hoover has advocated plenty of loans to halting business; Mr. Rorty wants the subsidy unqualified. He takes it up under two heads; one for the long pull, over the years; the other, as an immediate emergency measure.

The Rorty theory of permanent subsidy would depend for its dynamics on a small tax to raise funds over a long period of time. The tax should be separated from the usual sources of federal revenue, and it should be neither a luxury tax nor an additional supertax out of income. For, in the Rortian analysis, recovery involves a restoration of both the luxury and semi-luxury trades, if only as a sponge for the unemployed; and, moreover, the excessive supertax on income has a depressing effect on capital investment. Following this line of argument, Mr. Rorty advocates a retail sales tax of one percent or less, to be applied painlessly and steadily toward an eternal reserve for subsidies. Even a semi-successful business stabilization, which the subsidy is designed to accomplish, should reduce the cost of commodities by more than the amount of the tax, so the operation of the plan would come cost-free to the consumer.

The time to start subsidizing laggard business, says Mr. Rorty, would be at the moment when construction and new capital activities had fallen by a definite amount, say from 10 to 20 percent below normal. When this point on the graphs had been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reached, Mr. Rorty would advertise for bids for the initiation of new activities. All bids should be in terms of the required percentages to be paid as subsidies upon certified amounts disbursed for wages and materials, and the awards of bonus money should be made in the order of the lowness of such bids. The offer of the bonus should continue, even with increases, until an upturn in the business cycle had been brought into play; then, as new capital activity rose once more to the "normal" level, the subsidies should be tapered off and discontinued. Conversely, if building is to be stimulated at the bottom of the cycle, overbuilding should be guarded against during a boom, by credit restriction, or even direct taxation, to be increased progressively with the excess of construction over normal levels.

This, then, is the long-term outline of the Rorty subsidy plan. It would ostensibly act to cushion the shocks of the sudden switches in the operation of the business cycle.

Having satisfied himself as to the permanent features of his proposal, Mr. Rorty turns to the immediate situation. There is a real need for capital expenditures by business now, he thinks, since plants must be wearing out at a rapid rate. Obsolescence, he argues, must by now far exceed any possible overequipment. Using the machine-tool industry as his check, he notes that employment rose on its index from 82 in 1924 and 100 in 1926 (the base year) to 129.8 in 1929. Here, he says, is a clear indication of possible overequipment in 1929. However, assuming the total value of machine tools in service to be $15,000 million and the normal annual output to be approximately $3,000 million, it follows that the excess machine-tool equipment for 1929 was probably worth less than $1,000 million, while the annual obsolescence and wear on the machine tools now in service probably exceeds $2,000 millions.

For the present emergency, Mr. Rorty would have the government think in terms of $100 million a month for a six-month period, with an average of $50 million a month for a subsequent six or twelve months. It would be justifiable to borrow some $300 million and to supply the balance out of special taxes calculated to produce $50 million a month. The special taxes should be continued long enough after the immediate emergency had passed to retire any indebtedness incurred on account of subsidies. The whole thing should be on a relative "pay-as-you-go" basis.

The plausibility of all this must rest, of course, on Mr. Rorty's initial assumption: that a recovery from business depression comes only when credit and restored confidence gradually lead business men, large and small, to spend money on increased pay rolls and increased buying of materials. As we may have hinted, Mr. Rorty seems to be confusing the phenomena of recovery with the cause. The prime objection to his analysis and plan would seem to reside in the lack of a market for consumption goods which, presumably, the subsidized production goods would be used to turn out. Of what use is it to renovate a plant if that plant is to stand idle? Besides, as Lawrence Dennis says, "business men, for the present, can be trusted to do the planning necessary to deliver the goods, once they get the orders."

The persistence of the lean years must, in answer to Mr. Rorty, be attributed, not to lack of credit facilities, not to a failure of those making production goods, but to lack of effective demand. It is perfectly true that we are cursed, at the moment, with the underconsumption which is the other side of the shield called overproduction. But it is underconsumption, not because people are simply paralyzed in the pocket nerves, but because many people can't get hold of the mystic money tokens which will open the doors to the granaries. Group purchasing power is so unevenly allocated that those who want cannot buy, and those who can buy have all they want anyway, without buying any more until the start of inflation makes it desirable to turn money into goods. As long as deflation continues, people will hang on to excess cash in the sure knowledge that it will buy more tomorrow than it will today. If all this weren't true, our farmers would not be howling because of a lack of income with which to meet fixed charges. Many people are spending all they have. The Glass-Steagall Act of a year ago, with the subsequent open-market purchases of government securities by the Federal Reserve, made more credit theoretically available to business men by making banks gloriously liquid, but we know today that either business couldn't use the credit, or the commercial banks wouldn't trust those who wished money in return for commercial paper.

Business had no prospective markets upon which to base its confidence of sales and of resultant liquidation of any debts incurred in the production of goods. A subsidy for the making of capital goods, similarly, might be money tossed into a void. When steel production is at 15 percent of capacity, for example, it is because passengers aren't riding on railroads, because people aren't buying cars, because farmers aren't purchasing tractors and ploughs. The minute the farmer commences to make a profit on his wheat or cotton, the minute he can turn that profit into Fords and Fordsons, the minute railroads and steamship lines start shipping wheat, or any other commodity for which there is an effective demand, steel would go to 20 percent, to 25 percent, to 50 percent, of capacity. And the plants that have already, under cover of depression, renovated their stock of capital goods, would skim the cream off the new trade, and without any government subsidy.

The stigmata of business recovery, which Mr. Rorty mistakes for the causes, will not be observed until something more fundamental happens. There must be, first, an alteration in the relationship between various classes of prices and incomes; there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be a redistribution of purchasing power. This involves either deflation of fixed charges to a point where the ultimate consumer can freely purchase rather than hoard to meet payment on the mortgage, or an inflation of prices to a point where the producer can make a profit, this profit to be used in turn for current purchases. If construction activities were to start up before either, or a mingling of both, of these requirements are met, the economic motor would not be started; it would sputter, and fall dead again. And the business man in the driver's seat would be more than ever inclined to sell the car for junk. Construction activity cannot reëmploy 15 million men now out of work; it cannot restore foreign markets; it cannot raise the price of necessities, such as cotton and wheat.

The foregoing constitutes the major objection to Mr. Rorty's scheme. Minor objections there are in quantity. Subsidies might be used unfairly, as effective leverage with which to start price cutting. They might serve the favored business, or the lucky business, as rebates from the railroads once served Standard Oil. Then, too, Mr. Rorty has no real way of discovering just what is "normal" construction activity. Carl Snyder has figured that a 2.5-percent increase annually in production has been, roughly, the recent "normal," but he arrives at his conclusion by averaging out good years and bad. Any attempt to tinker with the process might affect our whole concept of "normality." The correct relationship between consumption and production can be progressively high or low, depending on a standard of living. As long as increased technological productivity on the one side is balanced by adequate distribution of purchasing power on the other, and as long as this purchasing power isn't drained disproportionately into the production of capital goods when it should be going into spending for consumers' goods, then "normality" is anything the human stomach and tastes can stand. If consumption could be stepped up greatly under an "economy of plenty," a 2.5-percent annual increase in production would be decidedly subnormal.

Finally, Mr. Rorty is an unconscious nationalist. This is nothing against him, for all nationalists are not of the jingo stripe, but it can be held against him that he has not fully documented his case in terms of his nationalist preconceptions. His subsidy would, in effect, raise the price level within the country if, by a long chance, it proved successful. This, as France and the United States have discovered, cannot be done without allowing other nations, working with lower price levels, to seize the export trade. Depressions are international, these days; to raise a price level at home entails compensatory tariffs, gold embargoes, import quotas. There must be a world price level or autarchy, other things being equal.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

Overstuffed Opera

THE DEPRESSION has finally shaken even the boxholders and stockholders of the Metropolitan Opera, among them its directors, out of twenty years of lethargy. With an air of invoking the doom of musical culture in this country, they announce that there can be no opera at the Metropolitan next season unless the public subscribes $300,000. It is to be hoped that the public will not respond. The quickest way to revive genuinely popular opera is to liquidate the present artistic bankruptcy of the Metropolitan by declaring that institution legally bankrupt. Its supposed assets offer no basis for reorganization; they are entirely frozen and inseparable from the Metropolitan's three greatest liabilities: first, the rigidly bad taste of Gatti-Casazza, whose complete lack of theatrical imagination, insensibility to any approach to style in *mise en scène* and encouragement of routine stage direction according to the stalest formulas, have wiped out any esthetic appeal that opera might have for a modern public. Second, the equally conventional taste of the Metropolitan's directors, who encouraged their pet *maestro* to do his worst and keep opera "grand" by filling the stage with inflated choruses, shoddy imitations of Third Empire ballets and stage settings that seem enlarged reproductions of chromos entitled "Autumn Woods" or "Spring Sunset" on the calendars which, in the brownstone days, grocers and butchers used to present to the cook for New Year's. Third, the persistent snobbery of the Metropolitan's boxholders, who cling to their double-tiered golden horseshoe—which sends the three balconies of cheaper seats so high in the air that the public, with whom opera is still genuinely popular, can see it in the greatest continuous discomfort only by straining their necks, their ears and their eyes. From most of these seats a bare third of the stage is visible; from many seats it cannot be seen at all except with the aid of individual periscopes, which unfortunately the present management never supplied.

In 1927 Mr. Otto Kahn realized that if opera were to gain popular support, the first requisite was a new opera house of a greater total capacity, and more cheap seats in lowered balconies with better sight lines. At his own expense Mr. Kahn assembled a site on West Fifty-seventh Street between Eighth and Ninth Avenues, at a reported cost of $3 million. Benjamin Wistar Morris and Joseph Urban had been commissioned to prepare plans for a new opera house. Urban, presumably finding Morris's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideas too conventional, broke away and completed plans of his own. Deems Taylor, then editor of Musical America, published Urban's plans in that paper. They were promptly and officially repudiated by the Metropolitan. For in enlarging and lowering the balconies—capacity was raised to 5,372 seats, a gain of 1,772—Urban committed *lèse majesté*. He not only reduced the number of boxes from fifty-four to thirty-five, but flattened them across a shallow first balcony so that most of the audience in the orchestra seats would have had to turn their backs to the stage in order to see the reigning families.

The reigning families were not satisfied. Objections were aired in the papers. The house was not "grand" enough. The site was not swell enough. Why not Park Avenue? The Park Avenue Association, through its president, repudiated the idea. Why not Fifth Avenue? It was pointed out that an adequate site there would cost at least twice $3 million. Mr. R. Fulton Cutting headed a committee to seek a more appropriate site, leaving Mr. Kahn with his Fifty-seventh Street plot on his hands. The proper site was never found. None of the reigning families was willing to finance its notion of the grandeur appropriate to Grand Opera, so that it might have a freshly gilded perch in another pretentious imitation of an eighteenth-century royal opera house. In view of this record, the Metropolitan's present appeal to the public to "save the opera" is disingenuous. Its boxholders, stockholders and directors represent one of the greatest single aggregates of personal wealth still extant. If they are willing to pay for the traditional privileges of an aristocracy endowing art and seat themselves in royal boxes as a reward, no one can object. But there is no reason why the public should supply funds with which to continue the pretense.

Opera can easily be proved to be a low and bastard form of theatrical art (with Wagner's music-dramas as perhaps the only esthetically defensible exception), an outmoded survival of a pastime appropriate only to courts and courtiers. Nevertheless it remains fundamentally popular. As radio has shown, we are somehow a music-loving people. And of all the vicarious satisfactions that the theatre can give, none is more satisfying to the average man or woman than living, loving and dying to music. It is this satisfaction that gives opera its glamor, which has always been achieved in large part by spectacle. At the Metropolitan it is dissipated by persistent shoddiness, shabbiness and vulgarity in both stage direction and stage setting.

Except at rare intervals no settings have been encouraged that are not replicas of the lowest ebb of nineteenth-century scene painting as perfected in Milan in the 1870's, although during the past twenty years this country has produced a revival of the art of scenic design which has transfigured our stages. The glamor that might have revived operatic production in New York has been seen not in its opera house but in its theatres—in "Swords" and "The Jest," in "Marco Millions" and "Volpone," in "The Miracle," in James Reynolds' period ballets for Murray Anderson's and Ziegfeld's revues—to mention only a few productions out of a possible fifty. To be sure Jones, Geddes and more recently Mielziner have been employed at the Metropolitan, but they were either given unimportant assignments or so harried and hustled, so limited by the rigid specifications of routine stage management, so persistently blocked at every turn, particularly by hasty light rehearsals with old-fashioned equipment, that their work has usually been a feeble refraction of the effects they achieve elsewhere as a matter of course, where they work with producers who are in sympathy with their aims and their methods. One designer is said to have submitted to the following examination without cracking a smile when he showed his sketches:

> Mr. X. (of the Metropolitan) What is this Mr. M.?
> Mr. M. A palm leaf in the jungle.
> Mr. X. But how big is it, Mr. M.?
> Mr. M. Thirty feet, sir.
> Mr. X. But our subscribers have never seen a leaf as big as that. It must be changed.

The objections raised are usually as ridiculous and often more exasperating. A modern designer, after executing a setting for the Metropolitan, talks as though he had managed to escape with his life from a Spanish Inquisition. Our two most brilliant scene painters, Anisfeld and Soudeikine, have been completely discouraged. Joseph Urban has survived at the price of shrugging his shoulders and turning out potboilers—a fact of which he himself is well aware. His last victory was his staging of "Cosi Fan Tutte" when he succeeded in scaling the little opera to the mood of Mozart's score rather than to the yawning proscenium of the opera house. Most of his work has been a return to the garish, postcard scene painting of traditionally operatic wings, flats and borders, which he himself discredited with his opulent architectonic and atmospheric settings for the Boston Opera in 1912. The exterior of the ducal palace in "The Marriage of Figaro" looks like a comfort station in Central Park abutting the Belvedere at the reservoir. The masque ball, with its enormous expanse of painted brocade, might be subtitled "Roxy and His Gang Enter Heaven." It was eclipsed by a setting in which Kundry rose through the stage floor in a bulbous bower that seemed a Byzantine easter egg and came to rest against a backdrop of milk-chocolate Alps.

The Metropolitan's settings are symptomatic of its incredible obtuseness to the simplest and most obvious theatrical values of the operas it stages. To take only one typical instance, the staging of "Carmen": at the end of Act I Carmen and Don José are lost in a Spanish Madison Square, because, in order to achieve atmosphere at the opening, an unwieldly chorus must mill about aimlessly. The act cries to be played in an arcade; through it one-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

half the number of supers could suggest the life of a Spanish plaza and then leave the two principals framed and emphasized by the setting at their climactic moment. The inn of Act II, if it is to have any theatrical value, must be a disreputable, out-of-the-way place, a hole in the wall, frequented by low-lifes, who, even when they take their ease, are anxious to keep out of the eye of the police, a place such that a gentleman and an officer would compromise himself merely by entering. But at the Metropolitan it is another Alice Foote MacDougall super-Spanish Coffee Shop, or the opening of a bigger and better night club, Madrid on Broadway. Nothing is lacking but a headwaiter or two and a hostess. The drama of the fortune-telling scene in Act III is completely dissipated by taking place in front of an army of smugglers, who seem the annual convention of the Affiliated Chambers of Illegal Commerce in Spain assembled to protest against the new customs duties. Is it any wonder that "Carmen," along with almost all other operas, seems tawdry and old-fashioned? If New Yorkers could see them restaged and redirected, they would see them with fresh eyes for the first time.

Unfortunately the Juilliard Foundation has just offered fifty "grand" in order that grand opera at the Metropolitan may continue. A number of stipulations are attached to the gift: more American singers are to be engaged, more American operas are to be performed, modern methods of production are to be introduced, students are to be allowed to attend dress rehearsals and there is to be a supplementary season of *opéra comique*. The New York Times headline reads, "Juilliard Subsidy to Save Opera." It is on the contrary liable to do nothing more than prolong its present death agony. No sum of money, whether $50,000 or $500,000, could improve Gatti-Casazza's taste, change his sympathies or his temperament so that he could attract and work with stage directors and designers who might give operatic performances new life. The same millionaires who have been unable to give opera any vital direction will still be in control. How will a staff that has made grand opera almost comic suddenly acquire the ability to stage light opera with grace and gayety? What, apart from the technique of voice production, can students learn from watching routine dress rehearsals of unimaginative productions, ludicrously costumed, tastelessly staged and crudely lighted?

The Juilliard Foundation could instruct its students far better in the art of modern operatic production by allowing the Metropolitan to close its doors, and then import for a season or two some of the best European examples, such as the Viennese troupe which sings Mozart to perfection against the tapestries of the Redoutensaal in Vienna, "Samson and Delilah" and Verdi's "Macbeth" as produced by Harold André in Stockholm in 1921, Federovsky's "Lohengrin" from Moscow, or Stanislavsky's new opera school in "Eugene Onegin" and "Bohême." Nothing is more futile or a greater waste of money than an attempt to keep opera grand, which sets a premium on big voices rather than perfect ones, and results in expanses of unnecessary scenery, overmanned choruses and love scenes played on half-acre plots. A few gauzes created the park scene in "Liliom"; no more would be needed for the park scene in "Pelléas and Mélisande." The wedding scene in "Peer Gynt" at the Garrick Theatre, with no more than thirty players dancing against a grove of trees cast by a lantern slide, was more effectively spectacular than any mob scene at the Metropolitan. Siegfried's forest or the vision of Valhalla projected entirely by light, dramatic oppositions of light and shadow—witness Jones' setting for the serenade scene in "Faust" given by the American Opera Company—can give opera its esential grandeur and keep the fluidity and ambience appropriate to a background for music.

The greatest handicap to learning how to give music drama fresh theatre values is our present opera house. The effort can be much better begun on a smaller stage equipped with modern lighting apparatus, in a renovated movie house seating about 3,000. The annual deficit there should not be more than the Juilliard Foundation could defray, while it assembled directors who could, with American scenic designers to aid them, produce operas that had some of the glamor, the force of drama and the fire of imagination needed to match their music. Let the Juilliard Foundation then summon the Phoebus Apollo of Philadelphia to conduct—he has already proved his capacities in "Wozzeck" without the aid of a single star performer—and set Urban redesigning his opera house without even one floor wasted on boxholders. Opera by that time would have recovered its prestige and its popularity. The new opera house could be financed (if anything is ever to be financed again) like the Guild's theatre, by popular subscription. And when it opened it should be packed to the doors.

Unless opera is made fit to be seen, it is fit only to be heard and should retire to the broadcasting studio.

LEE SIMONSON.

To Shakespeare

Through torrid entrances, past icy poles
A hand moves on the page! Who shall again
Engrave such hazards as thy might controls—
Conflicting, purposeful yet outcry vain
Of all our days, being pilot—tempest, too!
Sheets that mock lust and thorns that scribble hate
Are lifted from torn flesh with human rue,
And laughter, burnished brighter than our fate
Thou wieldest with such tears that every faction
Swears high in Hamlet's throat, and devils throng
Where angels beg for doom in ghast distraction
—And fail, both! Yet thine Ariel holds his song:
And that serenity that Prospero gains
In justice that has canceled earthly chains.

HART CRANE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Two Relief Bills—Honeymoon Express—The Banking Worm Turns—A New Way with Old Debts

THE SPEED with which the new administration functioned in the first three weeks has appreciably diminished, which is natural and inevitable. With the immediate banking crisis past and the two latest bills—farm relief and reforestation unemployment-relief—presented to Congress, Mr. Roosevelt had slackened his pace a little to look around.

It was interesting to note the manner in which Congress received these two bills and the presidential messages accompanying them. Caught on the one side by an overwhelming public sentiment which favors giving Mr. Roosevelt anything he demands as an emergency proposition, and on the other by their own doubt as to the ultimate popularity and workability of the measures, it is not too much to say that some of the Democratic leaders sweated profusely in those chilly days of middle March. There was a good deal of subdued muttering about having "things like this sprung on us," but the best evidence of their feeling was the refusal of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee to introduce the farm bill and the chairman of the Labor Committee to introduce the reforestation unemployment-relief bill, though they, at the same time, announced their support of the bills as a matter of loyalty to the President.

I hate to seem cynical, but I cannot help sharing the belief of the more sophisticated observers here that the real whip with which the President is holding his party in line is patronage. The public sentiment at present behind him is a powerful asset, but so long as the great bulk of the party positions remain to be distributed, the desire to get their full share—and a little more—has an even greater influence in keeping the individual members in tune with the administration. The combination—public sentiment and undistributed patronage—puts the new President in an extremely felicitous position.

There are two other assets Mr. Roosevelt possesses which seem to me as obvious as they are valuable. One is the fact that the leadership of his party and the leadership of the opposition in both branches of Congress is concededly weak. Ordinarily, so far as his own party is concerned, this would appear to be a liability, but actually, in this case, it is not. The reason is that, having no clear-cut ideas of their own, no legislative convictions or principles and no real hold upon their following, they are the more ready to follow the President, who, whether you differ with him or not, at least has no uncertainty as to the direction in which he is going and what he wants.

The disposition to accept his leadership, of course, is enhanced by the popularity he has attained since his inaugural. Perhaps it is easy to point out that much of this is emotional rather than reasonable, that it is due to the dramatic way in which he did inevitable things, and that his popularity cannot last. Nevertheless it exists, and while it exists any Senator or House member who dared oppose the President would not only weaken his position at home among the voters who want the President supported, but would deprive himself of the jobs for which the demand is voracious and insistent. Altogether, Roosevelt's position is about as strong as it well could be, and while the unanimity of support that characterized those first two weeks has already diminished, I none the less look for a continuation of the "honeymoon" for some time to come.

The other asset which I mentioned is the completeness with which Mr. Roosevelt has taken the "corps of correspondents" into camp. There are one or two bilious, slant-eyed fellows among them upon whom the jolly "hello pal" manner of the President at the press conferences rather grates, but the great bulk of them are highly delighted at the contrast with the austere aloofness of his predecessor, and enjoy themselves greatly in the verbal exchanges with the Chief Executive. The net result is that the Chief Executive has a perfectly grand press, so far as the news that leaves Washington is concerned. And if anyone does not think that is an asset, let him ask the leading citizen of Palo Alto.

Wholly aside from legislation, program and press, one act of the administration last week which contributed, I think, as much as anything to increase popular good feeling for Mr. Roosevelt, was the step taken by the Attorney General to prosecute for criminal violation of the income-tax law Mr. Charles E. Mitchell, late of the National City Bank. I, of course, have no idea whether Mr. Mitchell is innocent or guilty of the charge upon which he was arrested. None the less, I think there can be no doubt about the public attitude toward Mr. Mitchell and the popularity of the idea of testing his case in court. Though the investigation of Mr. Mitchell was begun before Mr. Roosevelt came in, the decision to prosecute him came from the present Attorney General, and there was significance in the announcement from his office that the prosecution was being made with the "definite approval of Mr. Roosevelt." It thus becomes a Roosevelt administration move.

The public interest in the case is largely due to the belief that the revelations concerning Mitchell, wholly aside from the income-tax business upon which he is to be tried, were to a large extent responsible for the banking collapse just before the inauguration. While the crime of which Mr. Mitchell is accused was concededly not an uncommon practice, the extent to which he washed out his income tax, whether legal or not, makes the case of great interest.

The fact is that before very long Mr. Roosevelt may be forced to use his prestige to prevent certain financial legislation from being passed. The sentiment in favor of guaranteeing bank deposits, of plugging up the tax-exempt hole, of paring down interest on outstanding governmental bond issues and of a more flexible currency that will broaden the metallic base, is too strong not to find its way into Congress. Along some of these lines, it is believed, Mr. Roosevelt is willing to go; along others he is not.

The truth appears to be that neither the financial nor the foreign policy of the new administration has as yet taken definite shape, though in the past few days the realization that June 15 will soon be here has compelled the presidential "inner group" to devote as much attention as it could spare to a consideration of the debt discussion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From what the President's "close friends" reveal, it is his desire to establish a plan that will avert the consequences of a default by British and French on the date mentioned.

The difficulty now, as always, is with Congress, which still opposes either further modification or reduction. On Capitol Hill, they would rather see default than reduction. Reduction being inevitable, the problem of the administration is to obtain a freer hand in the negotiations than the attitude of Congress now permits. To this end a scheme has been evolved of having Congress pass a joint resolution "advising" the President in advance, in a general way, as to the lines upon which the negotiations should be conducted. There is, it is declared, constitutional precedent for this procedure and it is understood to have Mr. Roosevelt's support.

Credit for the idea is attributed by some to Professor Moley; by others to Secretary of State Hull; by still others to the astute Colonel House, who, though keeping carefully in the background, is still in communication. I incline to the belief that Mr. Moley is primarily responsible. Certainly he has given more study to the debt question than anyone else near Mr. Roosevelt. The resolution, of course, would be drawn up by the administration and would be in such broad, general terms as to leave room for a lot of leeway. The whole idea, of course, is to get Congress back of the President before he negotiates. In effect, it would amount to a vote of confidence in whatever he does, within certain limits. It is a neat plan and it will be interesting to watch how it works out.

Washington. T. R. B.

Financial Merry-Go-Round

The Saucy Senate—An Imaginary Dialogue—N. Y. U. Suffers the Little Suckers to Come Unto It—Paying Rent in Gold

BANKERS are not always wrong. The Harriman National Bank in New York was the one big bank in the city which failed to open its doors when the bank holiday was ended. Its chairman is now under arrest. Last year when the Senate Banking Committee was beginning its search for Wall Street abuses, the Harriman bank thought the Senate Committee was, to say the least, impudent. On May 7, 1932, the bank inserted in The New York Evening Post an advertisement protesting against the investigation. Among other things the advertisement said:

> Washington is ill equipped to investigate important matters of commerce and finance affecting the public welfare; and, in the present instance, *there is no certainty that it will not uncover things much better left sealed.*

The white light of the Senate investigating committee which has been beating upon Wall Street shifted recently for one brief moment to a spot supposed to be removed from the haunts of the bankers. That spot was New York University. But the incident was lost in the more sensational revelations about Mr. Mitchell and his pals.

To understand this you must hear the following conversation between the president of the Investment Bankers' Association and the chancellor of New York University. It is necessary to warn you, however, that this conversation never took place.

President: As you know, Mr. Chancellor, many thousands are investing their savings in foreign bonds and we think some sort of agency should be established to safeguard them by studying these issues and giving the investors the right steer.

Chancellor: Right steer! Oh, yes, yes! The idea is an excellent one, sir.

President: Very good. So I thought that the university and our association might get together and set up an institute to study foreign issues and finance for the benefit of investors.

Chancellor: Tut, tut, Mr. Banker. You surprise me. First let me ask, do not you gentlemen do the selling of these securities?

President: Precisely.

Chancellor: But, sir, do you think that your organization is the one to be giving this disinterested advice to investors?

President: Perhaps not. That's why we want New York University to do it.

Chancellor: But you will pay the bills? Well, my good sir, what do you think will happen to the institute if our men should issue bulletins critical of your issues?

President: Ah, but Chancellor, our business is o.k. and we know it.

Chancellor: That may be very true. But one does not have to be the chancellor of a university to know that the man who pays the piper calls the tunes. If you pay the bills, you will very soon tire if the tunes do not please you. And I think it is putting too great a strain on the good judgment of the men who will issue the bulletins to make their pay dependent on the bounty of those they are to scrutinize. No, sir. If New York University establishes an institute to advise American investors of foreign securities, you may rest assured that institute will not be supported by men who sell the bonds. I bid you good day, sir.

This conversation, of course, never took place. What did take place, however, was that in September, 1926, New York University *did* set up an Institute of International Finance "to safeguard American investors in foreign securities," and the bills were paid by the Investment Bankers' Association. Dr. John T. Madden, Dean of the School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance of New York University, was made director and Mr. Marcus Nadler was made research director. Thereafter this Institute issued numerous bulletins on all sorts of matters relating to our foreign investments. Now for the Banking Committee and its cruel white light.

Mr. Hugh Baker, member of the executive committee of the Investment Bankers' Association and head of the National City Company—now resigned—was asked if the Institute ever submitted its bulletins to the interested bankers for criticism and revision. Mr. Baker denied it, whereupon Ferdinand Pecora, committee counsel, produced a letter from the Institute. It was written to an issuing house and submitted copy of a bulletin to be published by the Institute on Peru's finances. The letter read:

> We are enclosing a preliminary draft of the pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> posed bulletin on the credit position of Peru. We shall greatly appreciate it if you will be good enough to return this at your convenience. *As soon as we receive the draft of your suggestions* the bulletin will be sent to press.

Another letter was found by Mr. Pecora in the files of Mr. Hugh Baker in the National City Company—a letter addressed to the Investment Bankers' Association by Dean John T. Madden—reporting on the value of the Institute. The letter implied rather broadly that the bankers were getting a bargain. It pointed out that the director and assistant director of the Institute, being professors rather than interested bankers, because of their customary academic freedom, in addition to the bulletins, had access to the radio, important magazines, newspapers and lecture audiences.

Alas! Dean Madden wandered too far from the Academic Shades. Employed to teach banking, accounting and finance to blossoming young Morgans, Mitchells and Wiggins, he became a director in a bank himself—the Mercantile Bank and Trust Company. That was one of the two banks in Manhattan which did not open completely when the bank holiday ended.

When the Kreuger and Toll collapse shocked the world and American investors were in a panic, the bankers who had participated in selling these more or less worthless Kreuger and Toll securities promptly formed committees, as usual, to gather in the proxies of the injured security holders. The Institute of International Finance issued a bulletin, giving the personnel of the bankers' committees and adding:

> Since quick action is necessary to preserve the assets of Kreuger and Toll, the Institute is of the opinion that the interest of the holders of the above-mentioned securities would be best served by depositing them with these committees.

Fortunately the vigorous fight put up by Samuel Untermyer, Bainbridge Colby and Dr. Max Winkler for an independent committee saved the security holders from this advice.

Mention has been made of the Institute's bulletin on Peru, submitted to the issuing bankers for review. Last year Senator Hiram Johnson exposed the manner in which these bonds had been floated. Later still, Peru defaulted on its bonds, which amounted to $90 million. When the default came, the bankers formed the inevitable protective committee. And the Institute rushed into print a bulletin advising bondholders to deposit their bonds with this bankers' committee. The bonds are now selling at around three and a half or four cents on the dollar.

The episode leaves an impression that the staid old university has been discovered living with a "person" under most unhappy circumstances. The two should marry or separate, and I am disposed to think that universities and investment bankers' associations ought not to be allowed to marry.

The landlords have gone on the gold standard. Which means that tenants, now being presented with new leases, should read them carefully. Now leases for homes and business offices have always been made payable in "lawful money of the United States." But the landlords, with their usual beautiful trust in their native land, have had new lease forms printed in which rent is made payable "in gold dollars of the present weight and fineness." If by any chance we should have a touch of inflation you will wake up some fine month-end to find that your fifty-dollar house rent in ordinary bills is no good and that you will have to produce fifty dollars in gold which may cost you sixty or even seventy-five dollars in currency. The tenant can protect himself against this by refusing to sign leases in which the rent is payable in gold dollars.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

The Problem of Art Criticism: II

NOT LONG ago, as the first thing of the kind that I have tried for many months, I wrote a review of the retrospective exhibition of Maurice Sterne at the Museum of Modern Art; and thereupon received a letter, ably written by a genuine observer of art and highly critical of my performance. The main points of the letter were that my review showed that I was chiefly interested not in the exhibition as a "series of endeavors 'to organize masses in harmonious and dynamic pattern'" or in other painting values such as line, design, et cetera, but in literary and poetic satisfactions, in subject matter, in associative and secondary values rather than the painter's solution of "formal problems"; that Sterne is so dispassionate and detached a painter as to make it almost impossible to know anything about him from his art; that giving the names of the painters influencing him was of small importance. All of which meant that by my allusions to names, places, et cetera, and my employment of literary images, words such as "Franciscan," I showed little painting interest as such in Sterne's work; I did, however, at the very last, when it came to the "American in Anticoli," get down more nearly to business, bringing in the technical more definitely, speaking of the diagonal sequences, superb structure and so on. The letter's misapprehensions, twice about the nature of art itself and oftener about my little remarks —quite another matter, obviously—led me to try an answer. It also started anew that eager pathos I have often felt before with regard to writing art criticism that will appear in a book or in such a journal as The New Republic.

The case for an art review in a newspaper is different. There the public is to a large extent local, which means that you, if you wish to, can take the paintings and judge and indicate their design, organized masses, patterns and so on, and your reader, if he likes, may go to the exhibition, newspaper in hand, and standing in front of the picture note those matters. Not every critic and not every visitor may wish to do this wholly; it represents at least the extreme opportunity. But take the case of an article about the Sterne exhibition, written to go in a book or for The New Republic. The first thing to know is that we cannot assume that the reader has seen or will see the pictures discussed. We must decide then, at the start, as to what extent we will include details that, without a picture's having been seen—even in a photograph—can mean very little to the reader, however intelligent he may be. It might be better, however, instead of following up such a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point, to go directly on and try to describe at least the intention, successful or not, in the method I sought for this Sterne review.

The mere realization that not every reader of the article will ever see the immediate subject of it is highly secondary to one basic fact, which is that every art is a language peculiar to itself, and that some of the things said in it cannot be said in any other art—the mere fact of our five senses would tell us that. Every work of art, also, has, obviously, a content coexistent with and inseparable from its medium and the technical use of the medium; otherwise there would be no creation. To translate this content into another art medium is in itself a matter of creation. As translation it can never be wholly complete. As an effort to create in terms of another art it may achieve an artistic life of its own, complete—in so far as it is a successful work of art—in itself; but only after it excludes whatever could not be expressed in its own terms. To create something of a painting's content, therefore, in the art of words is hard and involves a highly imaginative process. And yet it is one way of conveying the painting's content to a reader.

But the very difficulty of such a task has, quite naturally, made writing about the *subject* of the picture a favorite practice; which brings us to all that familiar story-telling and literary patter that has so often amused the painter and sidetracked the public, as when the critic, seeing a dog by the shepherd's tent, devotes himself to the love of dog and master. We have not time to stay on that. Again, as with the technical details, I must decide to what extent, in mentioning one of Mr. Sterne's pictures, I will include the content or include the subject matter, one or both.

I began the criticism with a note on Maurice Sterne's life, his places, masters, prizes, this on the basis that, though —to take another painter—the "Birth of Venus" and a Madonna of Botticelli's must stand on their own feet as painting and for what they express, it can do no harm to know that he lived in Lorenzo's Florence and followed the Neo-Platonism of Ficino. Obviously the paintings of the two faces, of Venus and of the Virgin, are as painting independent of such facts; but without these facts it cannot be understood why in both cases the faces are the same, what it was in Botticelli's mind that led to this result. I gave the number of the paintings shown because the exhibition was retrospective and because the number of any artist's works is one sort of comment on him. I gave the influences, the masters behind Sterne, because the *dolci maestri* —as Virgil to Dante—chosen, followed, departed from, discernible directly or only very indirectly, are a deep source of comment on a painter.

I was obliged to include the drawings, a little of their subject matter, of their quality and especially of their line, because of Sterne's supremacy in this field; but I did it briefly, since there is no use beyond information, elsewhere available, in mere listing.

Of the 174 paintings I could mention by name a certain number, sometimes with an epithet by way of comment, meanwhile weaving in and out the strictly painting elements of color, texture, volume, and so on. Only three or four could be given a bit of space. For them I tried to discover in words (by drawing on associations, echoes, as it were, images, moods and phrase rhythms) passages that I hoped might be sufficiently in the nature of works of art to create something of the response to the artist's experience that the picture asks of us. Each picture thus briefly undertaken must, of course, present its own critical problem; to do the same to each one would be foolish. The most foolish of all, in this article, would have been the organized masses, dynamic pattern, line, *oeuvre,* sequences, et cetera, sort of approach; though it would have made the review infinitely easier to write. The test of the methods seems to me easy. Suppose of a temple frieze at Epidaurus nothing remains, not even a hint of its aspect, only the legend's word of it. Suppose we read in some critical fragment from Hadrian's time: "The temple boasts a frieze of youths on horseback. The rhythm is admirable, the mass organization into pattern finely dynamic. In color and line it is a masterpiece." Of this lost work thus praised, for us what of it? But suppose farther on in the roll came another fragment: "It is said that Alexander, heroic soul, lover of art, pupil of Aristotle, tamer of horses, passing by the city and coming to the temple, saw this frieze and stood looking at it a long time. And when he had looked enough, he went first to watch his Macedonian cavalry drilling on the plain outside the walls, and then afterward went alone and sat by the sea, studying the waves."

I should gather from that, I hope, something of the power in subject and in composition by which Alexander, having been for a time held before this sculpture, was led then to the actuality and rhythm of his men and horses, and then on to the abstraction of these sculptural elements that he found ceaselessly present in the sea waves. Nothing, of course, is proved by either of these fragments, invented by me for the occasion but for the moment accepted, as to whether the frieze was good or bad. If the fragments were genuine, even, the critic may have been myopic or talking in clichés, he may have faked the Alexander tale, or Alexander himself may have been posing for a myth to annoy Mr. H. G. Wells. As criticism the two fragments combined would, manifestly, judge the frieze more fully for us; but to choose, if we must, between the two seems to me easy: the frieze at least lives through Alexander, where the mere sculptural-values words are as lost and dead as it.

As to my getting down to business when I came to "American in Anticoli" at the very last of the article, that was merely a technical method. I saved the most important of the pictures (one also not hitherto shown) for the last, giving to it the emphasis of position and of more space. In this space I could set down something of the subject—as part of the experience to be conveyed to the reader—and something of the content, together with a much fuller analysis of the strictly painting qualities. By this stress on painting values I meant to imply that from the start the question of these values had been assumed as present in every picture. The organic, inseparable connection between form and content makes it impossible that, for instance, "The Winding Path" could have a different composition or a different content, either one, and be "The Winding Path." And I took it to be my business to achieve in the writing a tone and pitch that would be, as far as I was able to make it so, something, in another medium, contagious, by whose touch my experience of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sterne's art might be carried. And not only that. I should go so far as to say that, excepting strictly news notes or informative reviews, any essay in criticism ought to have a certain wholeness about it for the reader, regardless of acquaintance with the thing criticized. A piece of art criticism will gain, of course, with such an acquaintance. But something from the essay strictly on its own part should come off. Otherwise, except in so far as it is either sheer news reporting or sheer information, it is bound to be rubbish.

I am only trying to indicate some of the technical problems of an art criticism, as I see it, and why, when the post comes asking me to review the exhibition of some friend's best friend, I do not see the letter quite *couleur de rose.*

STARK YOUNG.

Alabama Speaks[1]

IN ALL that has been printed regarding the Scottsboro case, one important element of opinion has been conspicuous by its absence: the view of the general public in Alabama. Yet, obviously, nothing is of greater importance as affecting the outcome of the second trial, in progress this week at Decatur. In an effort to test Alabama's attitude, The New Republic wrote to a group of the leading citizens of the state asking them two questions: "Do you believe the Scottsboro boys are guilty?" And "Do you believe that an Alabama jury will now give them a fair trial?"

The answers received have refused, almost unanimously, to comment on the guilt or innocence of the defendants. Only two correspondents are willing to state that they believe the defendants are guilty, and both of these base their statements solely on the fact that the accused were found guilty by an Alabama court. Says Mr. Frederick I. Thompson, publisher of The Mobile Register, "Not being in attendance upon the trial, and basing my opinion upon the reports thereof and subsequent proceedings in review, it is believed by me that the verdict was proper." Judge William W. Brandon of Tuscaloosa County says, "I was not present at the trial of the defendants and did not hear the evidence. The court adjudged them guilty and I, of course, believe them to be guilty." Neither of these gentlemen makes any further reference to the decision of the United States Supreme Court which held that the first trial had not been a fair one. Incredible as it may seem, only one letter among all those received from Alabama takes any cognizance of that decision. That letter is also the only one which casts doubt upon the fairness of the first trial, or expresses any dubiety about the outcome of the second. One is almost tempted to believe that the press of Alabama must have agreed not to print the decision of the United States Supreme Court, and that the citizens of the state do not know of it.

Over and over in these letters appears the to-be-expected indignation that "outsiders" should meddle in Alabama's affairs. Thus Mr. Bruce Shelton, publisher of The Tuscaloosa News, says that "far too much 'to-do' has been made of this case. The idea that these boys are being persecuted is ridiculous. If the evidence is not convincing, they will not be convicted by an Alabama jury. If it is convincing, you may rest assured that they will be convicted." Grover C. Hall, editor of The Montgomery Advertiser, who objects to referring to the defendants as "boys," says that "they would get a fair trial in any county in Alabama—certainly a fairer trial than the people of Alabama have had in the forums of the world in recent months." Representative George Huddleston says that "the ignorant intermeddling in this case by remote outsiders, who are apparently moved by the desire to obtain for the defendants some special consideration merely because they are Negroes, is the only factor that may possibly have weight against them." Incidentally, Representative Huddleston hangs up a world's record of some kind by observing firmly:

> It is impossible for me to conceive how there could be any other attitude upon the part of any intelligent man, Alabamian or otherwise, than that these defendants charged as they are with a heinous crime should be speedily tried under the forms of law locally provided for such cases.

Two things are suggested by Mr. Huddleston's statement: (1) That he does not know they have been tried once already and (2) that he assumes somebody objects to court trials for persons accused of crime.

Mr. Thompson, already quoted, sums up the prevailing opinion when he says:

> It is my judgment that there has been manufactured a seeming interest which has sought to make the Scottsboro case one of racial discrimination, when it is my opinion that the same legal activity would have been employed had the figures been white instead of colored.

The one exception to the general attitude revealed in these letters is that of Mr. F. T. Raiford, editor of The Selma Times-Journal. Mr. Raiford reminds us that

> at the time of the conviction of the Scottsboro Negroes, I wrote an editorial protesting against the summary procedure which looked like a mockery of justice. That view and judgment was afterwards sustained by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Raiford believes, however, that

> on account of the operative procedure and mishandling which characterized the first trial, which was reversed by almost unanimous verdict of the high court, the most punctilious regard possible will be shown by the courts to the requirements of justice and fair play in the second trial. While trial judges are often susceptible to the subtle influences of public feeling when opinion is inflamed, they are also keenly alive to the importance of keeping their prestige high and of avoiding reversible errors. The Decatur trial will take place in a "cooler" atmosphere, free of the intense racial tension which prevailed at Scottsboro. Unfortunately the legal presumption of innocence is considerably diluted and weakened when invoked in behalf of a Negro charged with rape in our courts.

The New Republic's inquiry was sent to a list which we

[1] An editorial commenting on this article appears on page 199 of this issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believe included at least a majority of the outstanding public men of Alabama. Some of those on the list have not yet replied and others have requested that their views be kept confidential. Even the inclusion of the letters from the latter, however, would not materially alter any of the foregoing observations.

CORRESPONDENCE

Not a "Carpet-Bagger" Law

SIR: In commenting on the recent conviction of Angelo Herndon, Communist organizer, by the court of Georgia for sedition, The New Republic of February 1 made the error of saying that the conviction was made under a "carpet-bagger" law passed during the Reconstruction Period. Many in their comments have made this same mistake.

The law under which Herndon was convicted was passed in Georgia in 1865. All the Southern states in 1865 and 1866 passed drastic laws dealing with what was then considered sedition. It was a part of the "Black Codes" passed by the Southern states immediately following the Civil War. This section was to prevent all expressions of protest on part of the freedmen. The Reconstruction Act by Congress was passed in March, 1867. The statute under which Herndon was convicted antedated the "carpet-bagger" rule. The passage of the "Black Codes" by the Southern states was one of the major causes of congressional reconstruction and the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

C. H. HAMLIN.

Wilson, N. C.

Arms Embargo and War

SIR: Far be it from me to condone England's action in declaring an arms embargo against the two belligerents in the Far East. I think it was one of the slickest and most hypocritical performances that ever originated in the mind of that most slick and hypocritical gentleman, Sir John Simon.

But I have been disconcerted by all this sudden sympathy for China. "It isn't fair to China!" comes the cry, yes, even from the pages of The New Republic [March 15]—given as a justification of our continuing to sell arms to both of them (as well as to any South American patriot who has the cash).

Perhaps it "isn't fair to China." That seems to me to be regrettable but quite irrelevant. The question is: "Do we want to stop wars? Do we want to do everything in our power to make it difficult for *anyone* to carry on a military campaign?" Or, do we not?

I don't see how we can stop to decide what is fair, or not fair, to fighting nations. Carried to its logical conclusion your argument means that we should appoint ourselves judges (by means of expensive "committees of investigation," I suppose) every time two countries get into a scrap to decide which of them we shall sell arms to and which we refuse, in the future.

You're a grand champion of humanity, you New Republic! Carry on—stand out for arms embargoes on every nation that gets into a fight, and for curtailment of our own arms manufacture here! Let's do what we can to check the whole beastly system of armed warfare—and that worse thing, the piling up of dollars by the armament makers. They're the real villains of the drama. China will remain, whether the Japanese swarm over her Great Wall or not. She has seen invasions before and has lived. If she hasn't arms enough to fight a "modern" war she will engulf her invaders in her own immemorial way—it won't matter in the long run. That is China's affair, and Japan's. But let us stay out of it and not help either of them—or anyone else, in making and spreading war!

CHRISTINE HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Pa.

[The New Republic agrees with this correspondent. She has misunderstood our editorial paragraph, which was a simple statement of the facts. The sentence to which she refers reads: "While impartial in theory, it (the embargo) actually was a far greater blow at China than at Japan, since the latter country is at present well supplied with munitions."—THE EDITORS.]

A Call to Unemployed College Graduates

SIR: College graduates and the professional classes in general have been the group most severely affected in this depression. From the fragmentary and conservative figures so far published, one knows that there are at least 75,000 unemployed school teachers in this country; that in New York City alone there are upwards of 5,000 unemployed engineers, and 1,500 unemployed journalists. The American Library Association estimates that there are fourteen unemployed librarians to every position in the profession.

There is not one legislative proposal in Congress at present designed to cope with the problem contained in the above statistics. While President Roosevelt has been commendably active, the forces arrayed against him when it comes to significant unemployment relief and to more permanent remedial measures will prevent such legislation unless the people directly involved insistently and intelligently keep their plight under the eyes of their Washington representatives. Therefore the Association of Unemployed College Alumni calls on all unemployed college graduates and professional people to assemble in Washington, May 2 and 3, to discuss the basis for a legislative program of abiding permanence, and to call our plight to the attention of the nation's leaders. It is fitting and proper that the educated classes, which have suffered so terribly, should undertake such action.

Interested groups and individuals should send communications and inquiries to Dorothy Shoemaker, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City.

JOSEPH P. LASH, C.C.N.Y., Chairman,
JOHN W. PRICE, Kansas State Teachers' College,
DOROTHY SHOEMAKER, Swarthmore,
VARIAN FRY, Harvard,
MONROE PLANT, Howard,
PROFESSIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

New York City.

Extracts from Letters

RAY H. DOTTERER, State College, Pa., writes: "If, as a result of the relaxation of enforcement, public drunkenness increases and the social harm of the reviving liquor traffic becomes evident to all, there may be such a revulsion of sentiment as to make repeal impossible." . . . Howard P. Jones, of the National Municipal League, 309 East Thirty-fourth Street, New York City, announces a plan for "the formation of a Citizen's Council in every municipality and county to work for the maintenance of essential community services and for constructive economy in local and state government." The plan is endorsed by a long list of well known social workers, educators and publicists. . . . Mark Starr, of the extension department of Brookwood College, announces the itinerary of the Brookwood Chatauqua, which will be presented in New Jersey and Pennsylvania during the second half of April. . . . W. H. Baldwin, Wichita, Kansas, observes that "generally prevailing wage rates fix the price level at which goods can move. Wages are not only the principal item in costs of production, but wage rates also measure the dollar capacity of mass consumers to buy. A forcing down of the money wage rate, therefore, merely means that prices must be lowered or goods kept on the shelf. . . . Increases in the general level of money wage rates do not result in transferring wealth from the employing to the employed classes, but merely lift the price level; decreases in the general level of wage rates do not enrich the employing classes, but merely lower the price level at which goods can move; increased production in a country free from external debt can only be absorbed by higher wages or lower prices; higher wages never did cost employers or bankers anything, but actually did contribute to the great enrichment of many of them; the practical limit of safety in fixing wage rates is set by the fact that high wages tend to set up unfavorable trade balances with other nations."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Hudson River Progressive

Looking Forward, by Franklin D. Roosevelt. New York: The John Day Company. 279 pages. $2.50.

Government—Not Politics, by Franklin D. Roosevelt. New York: Covici-Friede. 107 pages. $1.

My Boy Franklin, as told by Mrs. James Roosevelt to Isabel Leighton and Gabrielle Forbush. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith. 115 pages. $1.50.

This Man Roosevelt, by Earle Looker. New York: Brewer, Warren and Putnam (Harcourt, Brace and Company). 233 pages. $2.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, by Ernest K. Lindley. New York: Blue Ribbon Books. 379 pages. $1.

THESE books by and about Franklin Roosevelt do not throw any very searching light on their subject. "Looking Forward" has been put together from his articles and addresses so as to provide a fairly connected and comprehensive statement of his views. "Government—Not Politics" is a collection of little essays, mostly from Liberty, on unemployment insurance, the tariff, the financial and business methods of the boom, the farm problem, etc.

Mrs. Roosevelt's memoir of her son gives a picture of him as an only child with a too-adoring mother, and retails a few family stories. Earle Looker also tells some stories and gives a first-hand impression of Roosevelt; but his book is one of those abject campaign biographies, made slightly ridiculous by nervous efforts to avert criticism of its hero on the ground of his money and family position. To listen to Mr. Looker, you would suppose that Franklin Roosevelt had become so furiously democratic that he could hardly even be persuaded to visit the family place at Hyde Park. Mr. Lindley's book is more solid. He covered Mr. Roosevelt from the beginning of his governorship for The New York Herald Tribune, and he has put together a pretty complete record of documents and facts. His book is advertised as "unbiased"; but Mr. Lindley is evidently favorable to Roosevelt. At the same time, he has no very vivid conception of his subject, and his presentation is as colorless as the clippings in a newspaper morgue.

Making all allowances, however, for the lack of brilliance of Roosevelt's biographers, one cannot feel that the personality which emerges from their accounts is a particularly arresting one. The best qualities of Roosevelt are unquestionably bound up with the landed-gentry tradition which Mr. Looker tries so hard to play down. The Roosevelts have been country squires living along the Hudson ever since the middle of the seventeenth century. Besides Theodore, they have included a member of the New York Constitutional Convention of 1776 and a diplomatic appointee of Grover Cleveland's. Franklin Roosevelt, unlike many rich Americans, has a sense of being part of a community for whose welfare he must take some responsibility. We may be sure that he will not do a great many of the things which have made the three last administrations odious. He will not waste the government's time drinking and playing poker. He will not appoint Cabinet Ministers who will sell the national property for bribes. He may be counted upon not to embarrass his friends and antagonize his opponents by brutality or bad manners. As diplomat, and hence politician, he is apparently of an unexampled smoothness. His mother testifies that "he always had a happy faculty for saying the right thing and, at the age of four, although later he took a more modest view, he was not averse to letting you know he thought so. . . . He had shortcomings, as many as other youngsters of his age, I am certain, but errors of judgment just did not happen to be among them." As Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he made life easier for Daniels by intervening between him and the people he didn't get along with and by justifying him to the outside world. It is his habit, according to one of his biographers, to end every argument with a laugh.

Here is an example of the kind of incident which could never have happened with Hoover, but with which the dispatches from Washington are now filled: "Senator Nye: 'Mr. President, I've got a 100-percent record of voting against you—on banking, economy and beer—so I thought it was time we got acquainted.' The President then threw back his head and laughed. 'No, Senator,' he replied. 'You were only 25 percent off. There were some things in those bills none of us liked. But I think they are necessary at this time.' . . . Emerging some time later after asking the President about his ideas on permanent remedial legislation, Mr. Nye described himself as 'highly elated.' "

And he will at least aim at a sort of justice different from that to which Hoover was inspired by his abject respect for big business. Public-utility magnates will not overawe him. Though the son of a railroad vice-president and director of corporations, and though himself once a corporation lawyer, he has still some of the democratic idealism of the days when Dutch merchants were rebels, and he has made some effort to see democratic problems from the point of view of changed conditions. He is at least superficially in touch with the enlightened thought of his time: there is a faint flavor of Charles A. Beard about him at moments. He understands, as appears from "Looking Forward," that the American frontier has been exhausted and that economic crises can never again be relieved by sending the unemployed West. He understands that "the man of ruthless force" who "had his place in developing a pioneer country" may today be an unmitigated disaster. He has been influenced by the talk about "planning"—to what degree may be judged from the following passage from the Introduction to "Looking Forward":

> I shall not speak of an economic life completely planned and regulated. That is as impossible as it is undesirable. I shall speak of the necessity, wherever it is imperative, that the government interfere to adjust parts of the economic structure of the nation, that there be a real community of interest—not only among the sections of this great country, but among the economic units and the various groups in these units; that there be a common participation in the work of remedial figures [what does "remedial figures" mean, by the way?], planned on the basis of a shared common life, the low as well as the high. . . .
>
> We do not want the government in business. But we must realize the implication of the past. For while it has been American doctrine that the government must not go into business in competition with private enterprise, still it has been traditional for business to urgently ask the government to put at its private disposal all kinds of government assistance. . . . Each group has sought protection from the government for its own special interests without realizing that the function of government must be to favor no small group at the expense of its duty to protect the rights of personal freedom and of private property of all its citizens.

This is a dilution of the thought of the economic planners which hardly leaves any thought at all.

And in general, he has shown little originality, little

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellectual boldness. As a boy, he collected stamps and stuffed birds; today he collects naval prints and stamps. His cousin Theodore, who became President when Franklin was a sophomore at Harvard, seems early to have stirred his imagination. As editor of The Crimson, he led a crusade against the exclusion from class-day honors of seniors not belonging to the best clubs and took a strong line in demanding more fire escapes and better boardwalks between the buildings. The idea of high-principled public service seems always to have appealed to his imagination without involving much political philosophy.

Later, Woodrow Wilson was to arouse his enthusiasm. He took a volunteer delegation to the Baltimore Convention, and when he happened to turn up in Washington a few days before inauguration, was offered the post of Daniels' assistant. In this role he was strongly in favor of preparedness and a big navy; and it is impossible to tell whether apart from this he did very much thinking about the War. His journal of his trip to France and England in 1918, as it appears in Mr. Lindley's extracts, is colorless and commonplace. After the War, as candidate for the vice-presidency, he campaigned for the League of Nations. After his defeat, he became New York Chairman of the American Legion Endowment Fund, National Chairman of the ten-million-dollar drive to finish the Cathedral of St. John the Divine and New York Chairman of the Boy Scout Foundation.

Roosevelt's own Boy Scoutish aspects—the spirit of cheerful service—which before his inauguration were getting a little on the nerves of the public, are partly attributable, apparently, to his disease. It is characteristic of infantile paralysis convalescents, according to Mr. Looker, to develop this slightly unnatural sunniness. For the rest, poliomyelitis has probably been of benefit to Roosevelt in that, forcing him to sit still, it has caused him to work and think. He told Mr. Looker that, before he was paralyzed, he used to waste a good deal of time going out to look at the garden or walking up and down the room—"I thought I was thinking but I was only walking." And he recalls that the elder Dumas used to have to be locked in his workroom.

Beside Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson, as whose successor the second Roosevelt presents himself, his personality seems rather pale; and it is significant that for eloquence he is likely to resort to the pastoral unctuousness of Wilson, for pungency, to the maxims of T. R. But though he lacks their force and imagination, he is evidently less a demagogue than either. His utterances at their best are clear, simple and unpretentious; and he is himself most impressive not in the role of political prophet, but as a sensible public servant trying to straighten out a bad mess in the interests of what he conceives to be the American democratic tradition.

After the burden of darkness and gloom which hung over the Hoover administration, this is, psychologically at any rate, a relief. Yet, even making the most of Roosevelt's merits, there is a flatness, almost a hollowness, about his assertions of the validity of this tradition, which prevents them from quite carrying conviction. "The quality of national politics, viewed as a science which is capable of affecting for the better the lives of the average man and woman in America, is the concern of national leadership—particularly in such years as these when the hand of discouragement has fallen upon us, when it seems that things are in a rut, fixed, settled, that the world has grown old and tired and very much out of joint. That is the mood of depression, of dire and weary depression which, if the quality of our political leadership is right, should vanish so utterly that it will be difficult to reconstruct the mood. Everything tells us that such a philosophy of futility is wrong. America is new. It is in the process of change and development," etc. It is true that T. R. and Wilson talked a great deal of balderdash, but they were both energized with the vitality of what was still a going concern. With Roosevelt when he tells us we are young, that a philosophy of futility is wrong, we feel the force of no popular conviction behind it. Admitting that he is sensible, decent, diplomatic, efficient, we ask ourselves whether politically he is based upon anything durable. Those who come to positions of power at the turning points of epochs—Marcus Aurelius, the Duc d'Orléans—are often among not the least cultivated, not the least conscientious of rulers, but they have the ambiguity of shadows.

EDMUND WILSON.

Our Second-best Prose

The Oxford Book of American Prose, edited by Mark Van Doren. New York: Oxford University Press. 657 pages. $3.

MR. VAN DOREN'S selection of American prose is stimulating in its challenge, both to those whose taste is orthodox and to those who depart from conventional evaluations along pathways of their own, which in most instances will also diverge from that of Mr. Van Doren. A glance over the table of contents is mildly startling, both in its omissions and in its inclusions. Among the American prose writers chosen for their qualities in "grace, intelligence, sinew, sonorousness and skill" the name of Ambrose Bierce, for example, does not appear. On the other hand, William Bartram is granted three selections. That Artemus Ward should be included is not in itself a surprise; it is, however, surprising to find that there is room for him but not for Oliver Wendell Holmes; for William Crary Brownell, but not for William Dean Howells; for Edgar Watson Howe, but not for Lafcadio Hearn. Moreover, those authors whom one expects to find and does find, are apt to be represented by unexpected excerpts, and excerpts which at least to this reviewer, seem to display less than the author's happiest combination of the qualities mentioned above. The essay on "Love," for example, seems hardly characteristic of Santayana at his best; and the same may be said of Henry James's "Charleston" and the extracts from "Walden."

Mr. Van Doren in his preface explains and to an extent defends his choice. But even accepting his explanation and defense, it is difficult to accept the results. In committing himself to whole units rather than to snatches, he also commits himself to the responsibility of that method, which calls for tact and wisdom amounting to inspiration if it is to convey the spirit and flavor of American prose. He declares that uppermost in his effort was "the desire to make the book in itself good reading." Yet his hope "that it can be read straight through—or failing this, that it can be opened anywhere and followed with the simplest kind of interest" fails of fulfilment. If this represents American prose, then American prose is sadly dull and tasteless. Laudable as is the effort to unearth writers not commonly appreciated, when the best that has been thought and said by Americans is suppressed in favor of the next-best that has been overlooked by most of us, the result is not calculated to satisfy America's idea of its own literature.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Mystery of Mary Stuart

The Scottish Queen, by Herbert Gorman. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 605 pages. $4.

MR. HERBERT GORMAN, an industrious and prolific man of letters, evidently in love with his job, has written this study of Mary Queen of Scots because "she was at once the most maligned and overpraised woman who ever lived who represented herself as a Lost Cause . . . and lost causes are always the most beautiful things in life." Standing below the monstrous bulk of Edinburgh Castle, black against the green North Country sundown, he was profoundly impressed with the timelessness of Time, or in other words with the modernity of Mary Stuart. She seemed to him the finest of all possible subjects for the historical novelist, as I take Mr. Gorman essentially to be in spite of the scrupulous industry of his documentation. Indeed, she is all of that for anyone who has the historic insight, the contempt for legends, the sense of pity and above all (I use the word advisedly) the *religious* philosophy requisite to rescue "the red star of boyhood's fiery thought" from the ash pile of propaganda and the clutches of the romancers.

Mr. Gorman has a fair measure of the qualities abovementioned, and he has done a good job. He is a little careless of details, a trifle spendthrift in style, but that is far better than being careless with the truth and prodigal of malice. We dislike the occasional abuse of such medieval, gaily caparisoned words as "orgulous" and "susurrus," or such slips as calling the English Church under Henry VIII "Protestant," but such things, after all, are trifles. What counts in an author like Mr. Gorman is the insight which can dispose of a whole Babbitt-warren of Froudes, Greens, Trevelyans, Thackerays, and light up a historic situation in a handful of words:

> Scotland [thanks to the Reformation] was to be a land untouched by the bright splendors of the Renaissance; there would be no Marlowes, Shakespeares, Sidneys or Bacons to make her reign memorable for its genius. Her days were to be passed among robber-barons and that cruelest of all classes of men—the religious zealot.

These two sentences give the key to Mary's position, to her tragedy as a queen in an age of absolutism. She was a princess of the Renaissance who came to rule a feudal country (at nineteen), a country which had retained all the worst political morals of the past, while adopting all the worst religious fashions of the present. At her advent, the real ruler of Scotland was the preacher John Knox, admired by Carlyle, whose psychology can best be studied in Mr. Mencken's loving analyses of the Methodist bonzes and holy men of today. The most powerful man after Knox was her illegitimate half-brother, the Regent Moray, adored by Mr. Froude, and the prototype—as Nicholas Hubert, Bothwell's valet, put it—"of all the rats that are or were to be." Under this precious pair was a snarl of enraged feudality made up of Gordons, Hamiltons, Hepburns and the like, whose favorite sport, as Hubert again puts it, was beggaring their neighbors. Multiply that snarl by the new Calvinist superstition and the result was truly devilish. The bonny kingdom of the Scots remained a veritable hell's kitchen so long as the lairds held a power that they shared only with the preachers—"beings," said good Walter Scott, "who hardly deserved the names of men unless it were that they stood on two legs." And when one adds to all this the intrigues of Cecil and the invincible hostility of Elizabeth, the failure of Mary and her six years' tragedy in Scotland can be comprehended at a glance.

We all know that they have been otherwise judged. Thanks to political and religious passions by no means extinct, Mary Stuart has been the victim of two opposing myths, the Tory-Catholic legend which makes of her a rather sheeplike martyr to that faith, and the Whig-Victorian legend which makes of her a nymphomaniac and a nuisance. In the whole course of nineteenth-century historic reconstruction it never seemed to have occurred to anyone that she was simply a woman of the Renaissance who wanted to make the best of the bad job of ruling Scotland.

It is the well intentioned romanticism of admirers like Lang and Maurice Hewlett which makes her appear a woman of mystery. There was no great mystery in her marrying Darnley, for he belonged to her own faith and had been sent north expressly by Queen Elizabeth to ruin her chances, as indeed he did. There is no greater mystery in her standing aside and allowing him to be murdered than in Elizabeth's standing aside and allowing Amy Robsart to be murdered, or standing aside and allowing Mary herself to be murdered at the end. There is even no mystery in the alleged Popish plot which brought about her death, so long as such things as government spies, "narks," "frame-ups" and a base political greed and a political religion exist in our world. It was only indirectly that Mary was executed because she was the champion of Catholicism. She was murdered because she was the next legal heir to the English Crown, because she was in good health after nineteen years of confinement while Elizabeth was thought to be at death's door, and because, if a Catholic became queen of England, Cecil and the other Elizabethan capitalists would have been forced to disgorge some of their excessive wealth, acquired from the confiscation of Catholic real estate.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT.

Why Call It Liberalism?

Liberalism in the South, by Virginius Dabney. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 475 pages. $3.50.

"LIBERALISM IN THE SOUTH" is disappointing on three distinct counts: it is indiscriminate where a careful selectivity is essential, it is superficial where thoroughness and depth are imperative, it is uncritical where a severe and uncompromising attitude is demanded.

Liberalism is, to be sure, a vague and flexible term; it is an attitude of mind rather than a doctrine. At one time it seeks refuge in individualism; at another it finds expression in social-mindedness. Mr. Dabney makes a brave effort to define his term with sufficient inclusiveness to embrace both "libertarians" and "humanitarians," but in his subsequent analysis he disregards even his own broad definitions and observes a catholic interest in all phases of intellectual or social activity in the South. The result is a generous democracy of record that seldom pauses to inquire into credentials of liberalism and often descends into a mere cataloguing of names; thus the sporadic listing of newspapers and periodicals in the South, thus the strings of authors and critics uncritically lumped together. "Other contemporary writers of fiction" Mr. Dabney announces, "whose work is in the liberal tradition are Elizabeth Madox Roberts, Mary and Stanley Chapman, William Faulkner, Evelyn Scott, John Peale Bishop, Caroline Gordon, Thomas Wolfe, Jonathan Daniels, Erskine Caldwell and Roy Flannagan." And

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You can go abroad

IN YOUR 2 WEEKS' VACATION—BECAUSE

BREMEN EUROPA

ARE THE FASTEST LINERS AFLOAT

All-Expense Tours
(Third Class Atlantic)

$183
PARIS—Four days and nights in the gay Pleasure City

$189
LONDON-PARIS-BRUSSELS—More than a day in each city

$192
LONDON-PARIS—Two days in each great European center

$198
BERLIN—Four joyous nights and days in the gay capital.

ENCHANTING DAYS in aristocratic London... gay Paris... picturesque Brussels... magnificent Berlin.

THRILLING DAYS in the spacious third class of the transatlantic champions with every modern comfort. Care-free hours of dancing, music, Munich evenings, sports and relaxation in the refreshment of sea air. Assurance of comfort and beauty in the social rooms, stately dining hall, bright decks, immaculate cabins.

Other longer tours to all Europe at lower and higher prices by Lloyd express and cabin liners and in all classes. Write for Booklets.

North German Lloyd
57 Broadway, New York

OFFICES AND AGENTS EVERYWHERE

Two Books of Paramount Importance

In Place of Profit

Social Incentives in the Soviet Union

by Harry F. Ward

With drawings by Lynd Ward

A realistic account of what life is like in the only land where men are not working for profit: written "from the inside" by a man who has lived with peasant, worker, and intellectual in Russian cities and villages. Contains original material, first-hand experience, trained interpretation, and the first analysis of the psychological forces behind the greatest social experiment of our day. $2.50

Moral Man and Immoral Society

A Study in Ethics and Politics

by Reinhold Niebuhr

"A book which may well prove to be as epoch making as the 'Social Contract' or the 'Communist Manifesto'... a ruthless book... which will help to make history."—*J. Middleton Murry in The New Leader* (London). $2.00

At all bookstores

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK

again: "It is doubtful if in late years any other section has produced a more brilliant coterie of critics of literature and life than Burton Rascoe, Joseph Wood Krutch, Laurence Stallings, Gerald Johnson, Herschel Brickell and the late Frances Newman. At the same time Stark Young has achieved a place in the front rank . . . and Irita Van Doren . . . has also been a liberal influence."

More distressing even than this lack of discrimination is the superficiality of Mr. Dabney's analyses. Mr. Dabney is interested, here, in surface manifestations rather than underlying causes. Nowhere in this volume do we find any searching analysis of the relation to Southern liberalism of the Negro as slave and as freeman. Many years ago Professor Dodd called attention to the evolution in the South from Radicalism to conservative Revolt: the change should be traced in philosophy, religion, sociology and politics, but Mr. Dabney has been content to note occasional manifestations of this shift without accounting for it. Again, the evolution from the Deism of the Revolutionary period to the rigid orthodoxy of the nineteenth century is one of the striking phenomena of our intellectual history, but Mr. Dabney has not attempted to explain it. This superficiality obtrudes itself in more specific comment. Thus, of Sidney Lanier: "His work was done in the new realistic mood," and "if he failed to attain true greatness as a poet largely because of the excessive didacticism of his verse, he nevertheless deserves high rank." A single quotation from "The Symphony" with its savage indictment of industrialism, a single excerpt from the illuminating private letters, would be worth infinitely more than these glib and empty generalizations about "high rank" and "realistic mood."

It would be a pity to leave the reader with the impression that Mr. Dabney's volume is entirely inadequate. It is both informative and suggestive, contains a mass of organized material on such matters as education, journalism, religion and the race problem, and should be useful as a point of departure for further study.

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER.

Miners out of Work

Machine Age in the Hills, by Malcolm Ross. New York: The Macmillan Company. 248 pages. $2.

TO ANY person who still doubts the existence of technological unemployment, Malcolm Ross's picture of "Machine Age in the Hills" will come as an arresting object lesson. His survey treats of an industry which is not only down, but out. Furthermore, it is no mushroom growth, no frill-like luxury trade, but one of the very bases of the entire industrial structure—coal.

The author goes straight to the region which has figured most prominently in the troubled news of the past two years, the mines of southern West Virginia and Kentucky. It is his contention that this region furnishes a microcosm in which one may study the entire cycle of the impact of the machine age upon a pastoral civilization. Mr. Ross experiences some difficulty in maintaining the full import of his thesis, but he does present a vivid and comprehensive picture of actual conditions. He spent many months in the field, talked with miners, operators, relief workers and officials, and examined the gnarled dilemma which lies at the bottom of the difficulty. Miners are thrown out of work not so much by improved mining machinery as by the existence of far too many mines, coupled with the vigorous competition of newer fuels, crude oil, gas and electricity, which lessen the demand for coal itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meanwhile an entire people has been drawn off the land and set adrift in an industry which brought them—even before 1929—face to face with an actuality of starvation which we ordinarily associate only with China and India. It is in dealing with this aspect of the situation that Mr. Ross is at his best. He is primarily a reporter, and these salty, God-fearing, intensely individualistic and purely Anglo-Saxon mountain folk offer rich case histories for his humanistic pen.

The deflation of the coal boom has left them in pitiable squalor. The boom came in the closing years of and just after the War. Prices and demand rose to fantastic heights. Few persons familiar with West Virginia will forget how the small-scale "horse and wagon" mines sprang up even in the thinnest fields. Now, after more than a decade of deflation, after Williamson and Matewan, after Harlan and the goaded Dreiser, and the Communists, the liberals and the students, after riot and bloodshed, there arises the inescapable fact: more than one-half the available miners must remain permanently unemployed, and their white-faced broods face the permanent threat of starvation.

Mr. Ross wisely refrains from supplying a convenient villain. Flaming abuses and medieval oppression can be ascribed to some operators, but the operators as a class are now bankrupt, just as the miners as a class are now starving. The humane and efficient relief work of the Quakers —to whom Mr. Ross pays deserved tribute—is but an anodyne whose potency is even now exhausted. Mr. Ross's own recommendation, the British procedure of a penny-a-ton tax on all coal produced to go for welfare work among the miners, seems hardly a final solution. So long as a great and basic natural resource such as coal is left open to unlimited private exploitation, so long will there be misery and chaos.

T. R. CARSKADON.

Book Notes

HISTORY

CARAVAN CITIES, by Michael I. Rostovtzeff. Translated by D. and T. Talbot Rice. *New York: Oxford University Press. 246 pages. $4.50.*

The cities of which Professor Rostovtzeff writes in this book are Petra, in the southern part of the Transjordan country, the ancient capital of the Nabatean Arabs; Jerash, or Gerasa, in northern Transjordania; Palmyra, the Tadmor of the Bible, made famous by the exploits of Zenobia; and Dura, on the upper Euphrates. The study is based on recent archeological excavations as well as on the rather scanty historical references of ancient writers. There is given a general survey of the caravan trade of the Near East in ancient times, followed by an account of the rise and fall of the commercial and political fortunes of each city; these are shown to have been determined by the relations between the successive great powers of the ancient world: the Mesopotamian empires, Egypt, Seleucid Syria, Rome, Parthia. A detailed account of the ruins of Palmyra and Dura, accompanied by numerous illustration of their buildings and sculptures, concludes the book.

OUT OF THE PAST OF GREECE AND ROME, by Michael I. Rostovtzeff. *New Haven: Yale University Press. 146 pages. $2.*

Written primarily for older boys and girls, this little book can very well be read and enjoyed by adults. Some of the chapters deal with well known subjects, like the Olympic Games, and Pompeii and Herculaneum. Others treat of the periphery of ancient civilization: life along the Black Sea coast, the caravan cities of Petra and Palmyra, etc. Perhaps the most interesting chapter describes a comparatively recent find in Egypt: hundreds of letters, of the time of the Ptolemies, which tell the story of an extension of the cultivated area and the building of a new city in the desert. There are many illustrations.

A brilliant history of man's mental development through the ages as shown by changing ideas!

Adventures of Ideas

By ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD

The author of *"Process and Reality"* and *"Religion in the* Making" writes with fascinating imagination and eloquence of the *career* of potent and vital ideas, and of the relationship of the various changes to developing civilization. He treats of the subject from the sociological, philosophical and cosmological standpoints, the result being a book to delight every reader who is a *thinker.*

•

"One of the most refreshing adventures of which I know. Intensely stimulating and thought provoking."—*Harry Hansen, New York World-Telegram.*

•

"A timely contribution . . . it gives us courage to believe that other ideas, such as that of the abolition of war, may yet succeed."—*New York Times.*

•

"Strewn with insights . . . the section on Civilization, the most arresting, is a fusion of genuine esthetic sensibility and intellectual mysticism."—*New York Herald Tribune.*

•

"Extraordinarily illuminating . . . the reader is well rewarded."—*Book of the Month Club News.*

$3.50

At bookstores everywhere

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 Fifth Ave. New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Public Questions

OUR OBSOLETE CONSTITUTION, by William Kay Wallace. *New York: The John Day Company. 226 pages. $2.*

Mr. Wallace argues that in the United States, as in most other countries, a revolution is actually in progress, whether we are willing to acknowledge it or not. The Constitution has ceased to be workable. The political organization of the country has become an obstacle to further progress. The safeguards of private property and individual liberty which the Constitution provides, are continually being violated. They have to be, for society consists nowadays of corporate units and not, as formerly, of individual units. He proposes a constitutional convention to formulate a new Constitution, which will reëstablish society on the new foundations laid by the highly developed capitalistic industrialism. The main principles and provisions of the new Constitution which he outlines are designed, in effect, to facilitate a gradual and painless transition from capitalism to socialism.

Fiction

FEVER HEAT, by Joseph Maria Frank. *Translated by F. H. Lyon. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.*

This is one of the many novels which Germany is producing about the emotional problems of her chaotic political situation, novels of all shades of doctrine, generally of no special distinction but on the whole honest in their mediocrity. "Fever Heat" stands out above other books of its type by virtue of being straightforward, clear and touching. The hero, a Wellsian schoolteacher, is appointed headmaster of the *Gymnasium* of a small industrial city. His activities have been philosophical and pedagogical, and intentionally "above" politics. The new post brings him into the midst of fierce political hatreds. The school, far from being a haven of quiet intellectual preoccupation, is actually an intensification of the emotions of the town, with the students even more vehement than the teachers. Eventually the *Gymnasium* becomes the central point of the many enmities and it grows increasingly clear to the schoolmaster that political action and not disinterestedness must combat the cruelty that characterizes the reactionary faction. Dismayed by the class bias of the three leading parties and desiring to serve the whole of Germany, he runs for the Reichstag on the ticket of the now defunct, then new, State party. But the election was the one which consolidated the great Nazi gains; the humiliating defeat of his party and principles drives him to suicide.

Contributors

John Adams Kingsbury, for twelve years secretary of the Milbank Memorial Fund, is a director of the National Tuberculosis Association and a fellow of the American Public Health Association and of the New York Academy of Medicine. During the years 1914-1918 he was Commissioner of Public Charities in New York City.

John Chamberlain, assistant editor of The New York Times Book Review, is about to join the editorial staff of The Saturday Review of Literature. He is the author of "Farewell to Reform," which was issued early this year by Liveright.

Lee Simonson, the well known scenic designer who has staged numerous plays for the Theatre Guild, of which he is a director, is the author of "The Stage Is Set," which was published last October by Harcourt, Brace. During the past season his settings have included "The Good Earth," "Red Planet" and "American Dream."

Hart Crane's collected poems are being published this week by Liveright.

Cuthbert Wright, author of "The Story of the Catholic Church," teaches English and History at St. Andrew's School in Tennessee.

T. R. Carskadon has done journalistic, radio and advertising work in San Francisco and in New York City, where he now lives.

Henry Steele Commager, professor of History at New York University, was co-author of "The Growth of the American Republic," which was published by the Oxford Press.

ACME THEATRE
14th St. & Union Sq.
Phone: ALg: 4-9620
The Rendez-vous of the Intelligentsia

Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday, March 31, April 1, 2, 3
RENE CLAIR'S
"A NOUS LA LIBERTÉ"

AMERICAN PREMIER—AMKINO PRESENTS
"RIVALS"
Commencing Tuesday, April 4th
Produced in the U. S. S. R. One of the best films brought to the U. S. A. from the Soviet Union.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE
At Cooper Union
8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, March 31st
PROFESSOR RICHARD McKEON
"Dewey and Deweyism."

Sunday, April 2nd
PROFESSOR HARRY A. OVERSTREET
"Where Shall We Turn for a Social Pattern?"

Tuesday, April 4th
DOCTOR HENRY J. FRY
"Experimental Methods: The Study of Cells by Moving Picture Photography."

The Society for the Advancement of Judaism
15 West 86th Street
FORUM
Sunday Morning, April 2nd, 10:45 A.M.
DR. MORDECAI M. KAPLAN
will speak on
Whither Judaism?
Musical Program *All Are Welcome*

POSITIONS WANTED

SPECIAL SERVICES

Author, 32, free-lancer to better-type magazines, whose first book (non-fiction) has recently been receiving extraordinary amount of favorable reviews, wishes to devote April and May to a job, full- or part-time, on salary. Research task preferable, as this is his strong point. Box 750, The New Republic.

College man, 29, married, liberal views, 10 years experience in advertising, office organization, personnel. Weary of hoodwinking consumers, desires connection with socially useful and necessary activity. Address: P. O. Box 223, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Man, 40 unencumbered, former foreign service officer, university teacher, writer, will consider anything consonant with his training and experience, here or abroad. Address: Arnold A. McKay, Maxton, N. C.

Order your books—all books—mailed anywhere in the U.S.A.
POSTAGE FREE
from
The New Republic Bookstore
419 West 21st St., New York City

GENERAL

TIRED OF BUNK AND HOOEY?
Then try a membership in CONTACTS, the only correspondence club for the mentally isolated, which connects you with original thinkers all over the world. Unusual books loaned free. Send 3c stamps to CONTACTS, 211 East 11th Street, New York City.

FOR RENT

2nd floor apartment, 5 rooms. College woman's attractive farm home. 15 acres, 30 miles out, hilly country—preferably six months or year's lease. Box 238, Nanuet Rockland Co., N. Y.

BOOKS

READ RARE BOOKS

Members read without buying rare, scarce, out-of-print books; limited, privately printed editions, unexpurgated translations. Write for information giving age and occupation.
ESOTERIKA BIBLION SOCIETY
"DEPT. C-6" 15 East 45th Street, New York

MAGAZINE

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government.
SPECIAL OFFER
2 Months
9 Issues 25c
STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 25 cents today and be sure to receive the next nine extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED